HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XXXVI APRIL, 1943 NUMBER 2

JOHN MAXENTIUS AND THE COLLECTIO PALATINA

WILLIAM C. BARK
LAWRENCE COLLEGE, APPLETON, WISCONSIN

BY MEANS of his definitive edition of the Collectio Palatina the late Eduard Schwartz made possible the revision of several long accepted theories concerning its source, date, and purpose.[1] That collection of writings almost exclusively devoted to the Pelagian and Nestorian heresies, which had been generally regarded, since its edition in the seventeenth century, as the work of Marius Mercator, Schwartz believed to be a product of the sixth century. He also believed that the collection was prepared in the course of the violent theological struggles of Justinian's time and he ventured to conclude that the Palatine collector was chiefly interested in the anti-Origenistic and anti-Nestorian struggle centering about the Three Chapters. These surmises as to the date and purpose of the collection led Schwartz to make still another assumption concerning a certain John of Tomi who is mentioned in the collection. It is the purpose of this paper to consider the identity of John of Tomi more fully and to give some indication of his importance in connection with the Palatine Collection.

The collector first refers to 'our most blessed father John, bishop of the city of Tomi in the province of Scythia' at the end of a long series of writings in defense of Cyril of Alexandria and against the leaders of the Antiochene theology.[2] He explains that it is the custom for the Eutychians to call those re-

[1] Thus Schwartz named the collection, which he edited in his Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum, I, 5, pars prior (Berlin and Leipzig, 1924–1925). This edition will hereafter be referred to as ACO I, 5. Roman numerals with ACO I, 5 refer to the first preface.

[2] See the concluding passage of what appears to be the original collection, ACO I, 5, 181. Additional translations have been appended but these almost certainly do not belong to the work as it left the hands of its author. Schwartz appropriately called them *additamenta*.

futing them Nestorians, and conversely for the Nestorians to call their enemies Eutychians. So the collector, fearing the Nestorians will call him a Eutychian, thinks it well to expose both 'depravities' by means of John's '*sermones*.' He also gives the very helpful information that both heresies are stealthily diffusing themselves among a great many who are too ignorant to recognize them. Unfortunately the discourses which were going to make it possible for simple people to detect the heresy of both Nestorians and Eutychians are missing, and along with them any final remarks of the collector and his signature, if there were such.

Schwartz made a brilliant conjecture as to the identity of John of Tomi, based on this reference to the bishop and his discourses against the two heresies. He had to be a Scythian, important enough to be appointed bishop, and an enemy of Nestorianism and Eutychianism. In John Maxentius Schwartz believed he had his man, for at the time of the struggle over the Three Chapters John was writing treatises against the Acephali and Nestorians and fighting against Roman opposition for the Christological formula that had been adopted by Justinian. Under the circumstances it seemed more than possible that Justinian made Maxentius bishop of his home province of Scythia Minor.[3] Valentinianus became bishop of Tomi in 550 and hence, if John Maxentius held the office, it was before that date, in the earlier years of the Three Chapters controversy.[4]

There is another significant connection between the Collectio Palatina and John Maxentius, however, which serves to strengthen the case for the identity of Maxentius and John of Tomi. This connection is revealed by nothing less than John Maxentius's citation of three of Cyril's anathemas, taken from the Alexandrine's synodical letter, in the translation of Maxentius's friend and compatriot, Dionysius Exiguus. The anathemas, as quoted by Maxentius, are not in the form of the original translation, but in a recension prepared either by Dionysius

[3] ACO I, 5, VIII and Sitzungsb. d. Bay. Akad. zu München, hist.-phil. Klasse, 1922, 9. This work will be cited hereafter as Bay. Akad.

[4] ACO I, 5, VIII.

himself or by Maxentius.[5] When it is further revealed that the same translation, though in a somewhat different recension, is to be found in the Palatine Collection, a very important point becomes clear.[6] It is proved beyond doubt that the collection was made in the sixth century, and this fact stands, no matter whether the recension of Maxentius or that of the Collectio Palatina was made first.

It is not at all surprising that Maxentius used the translation of Dionysius Exiguus, who was as keenly interested in the doctrinal controversies of his time as were the rest of the Scythian monks and repeatedly made translations of theological works for their use. His translation of Cyril's synodical letter together with its twelve anathemas was prepared probably in the year 519.[7] It could not have been taken into the Palatine Collection, therefore, before the sixth century and a close tie between the collector and John Maxentius is established. As for the confusion which led Maassen to fear that Dionysius Exiguus had been guilty of stealing Mercator's translation of Cyril's synodical letter, it is banished.[8] Mercator did not translate the letter in the Collectio Palatina; it was introduced into that compilation by someone, clearly a Scythian monk, who had access to Dionysius's translations, as did all the Scythian fraternity.[9]

[5] See Schwartz's whole discussion of this subject in his study 'Die sogenannten Gegenanathematismen des Nestorius' in Bay. Akad., 1922, but particularly pp. 15–21. Maxentius quotes the anathemas in his Libellus fidei, which was laid before the papal legates in Constantinople on May 25, 519 and then submitted to the pope in August of the same year. See also B. Nisters, 'Die Collectio Palatina,' in Theologische Quartalschrift, Augsburg, 1932, 113, 119–137 and Viktor Schurr, Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius im Lichte der „skythischen Kontroversen," Paderborn, 1935, 180. Both of these works are hereafter cited by the author's name.

[6] Recensions of Dionysius's translations are also to be found in the Collection of the Vatican MS., so named by Maassen, and in the Hadriana aucta. See Bay. Akad., 18–19.

[7] Schurr believes that Dionysius translated the synodical letter late in 518 or, more likely, in 519, in opposition to Schwartz, who favored the year 497. Schurr makes a good case for the later date. See his discussion of his own and Schwartz's point of view, 174–181.

[8] For Maassen's discussion see Geschichte der Quellen . . . 1, 131–135, 424.

[9] There is still another tie between Maxentius and the Palatine Collection. Among the *additamenta* is a translation of Cyril's Scholia de incarnatione unigeniti, a work capable of giving support to the views adopted by the Scythian monks in the Theo-

There can be little doubt that the John of Tomi named in the Palatine Collection was John Maxentius, the leader of the Scythian monks. And there can no longer be any doubt at all that the work of compiling that theological armory was not done by Marius Mercator in the fifth century. The inclusion of a recension (or perhaps more than one) of Dionysius's translation of Cyril's *epistola synodica* proves that finally and completely. One could wish, nevertheless, that the case for the identity of Bishop John of Tomi and John Maxentius could be made stronger than Schwartz left it. It will be remembered that the collector proposed to use John's '*sermones*' on account of the success with which the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies were taking advantage of the ignorance of their victims. Schwartz has attempted to find these '*sermones*' in Maxentius's Dialogus contra Nestorianos and Responsio contra Acefalos.[10] But the collector seems to have had in mind something less complicated than those two doctrinal polemics, something more in the nature of simple definitions, such as even plain people could understand and use for their own protection. The collector indicated this when, shortly before mentioning John of Tomi, he announced that he planned 'at a suitable time' to expose the heretics who were deceiving 'the simplicity

---

paschite controversy. The inclusion of the work here becomes more significant when Schwartz points out, ACO I, 5, XIV, that John Maxentius used the Palatine translation of the Scholia in his *libellus* of 519. It is impossible to say with any certainty who translated the Scholia but a reasonable conjecture may be made. The translator used repeatedly by the Scythian monks was Dionysius Exiguus, who was as well versed in Greek as in Latin, according to his friend Cassiodorus, Institutiones I, 23 (ed. Mynors, p. 61). Dionysius was moreover clearly devoted to the theological teachings of Cyril of Alexandria and in the preface to his translation of Cyril's letters 45 and 46 he declared that he would translate still more of the Alexandrine's writings for the monks. Yet his only other known translation is that of the synodical letter. Did the canonist for some reason fail to oblige his brothers or did he do more translations which have somehow become lost? The latter seems to me much more likely and the version of the Scholia quoted by Maxentius may be one of the lost translations. For a discussion of the known translations made by Dionysius for the Theopaschite controversy see Schurr, 168–197.

[10] Note that the second work was not directed against the Eutychians in general but against those dissident Acephali who despised not only Chalcedon but even those who had accepted the Henoticon. For the Acephali see L. Duchesne, L'église au VIe siècle, Paris, 1925, 72. The Scythian attacked the Eutychians in his Libellus fidei, ACO IV, 2, 8–9.

of the faithful.' [11] He thus emphasized so strongly the need for something adequate for the ordinary man, rather than the theologian, that Schwartz's suggestion of the two aforementioned treatises cannot be accepted.

There is, however, more evidence, overlooked by Schwartz, which strengthens considerably the assumption that John of Tomi and John Maxentius are one, and indeed all but puts it beyond question. Schwartz nowhere found any trace of John of Tomi described in precisely those words, but actually the Palatine collector's reference to John of Tomi is not the only one extant. Many years ago, while examining Codex Laud. Misc. 92, G. Morin noticed that it had originally formed a single volume with Codex Laud. Misc. 580.[12] This was shown by the summary of the contents placed at the end of Laud. Misc. 580, as well as by the writing and all the other external particulars. The summary indicated that the volume contained certain works of Fulgentius of Ruspe followed by the works of John Maxentius. As divided when Morin found them, Fulgentius was in Laud. Misc. 92 and Maxentius in 580, so that originally, it would appear, the book continued with the Scythian writer after finishing with the African. But it is just here that Morin made an important discovery. Immediately following the writings of Fulgentius at the end of Laud. Misc. 92 comes a short treatise on the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies by John, bishop of Tomi in the province of Scythia. The '*sermones*' promised by the Palatine collector but lost out of his huge collection were found! [13]

The presence of the treatise in this particular place requires examination. Its location in what was once but one volume indicates that it was placed not at the end of Fulgentius's works but rather at the beginning of Maxentius's. When the original volume was divided, John's treatise on the Nestorians and Eutychians went with Fulgentius for the simple but

[11] ACO I, 5, 180.

[12] G. Morin, 'Le témoinage perdu de Jean évêque de Tomi sur les hérésies de Nestorius et d'Eutychès,' in The Journal of Theological Studies, 7 (1906), 74–77. Schurr mentions Morin's find, but little more.

[13] As Morin, 76, remarked, simply 'words' and not 'sermons' were meant by '*sermonibus*.'

sufficient reason that it was copied on the last leaves of the last quire of Laud. Misc. 92, where it was followed, on the last remaining leaf, by an excerpt from Ambrose, de substantia.[14] Fulgentius proper begins on folio 2 of Laud. Misc. 92 and ends on folio 174 seven lines from the bottom. John of Tomi comes immediately thereafter, ending with line five on folio 175, to be followed immediately by the excerpt from Ambrose, which runs to the middle of the last line of the last page (folio 175^{v}).[15] Dr. Lowe agrees with Morin that the Fulgentius and Maxentius appear to have been copied by the same hand. John of Tomi and the Ambrose excerpt he believes to have been written by a different but almost contemporary hand.

Originally there were apparently three whole folios (six pages) and part of a fourth left blank after the last work of Fulgentius had been copied. But since the last pages of quire XXI have been tampered with, it is now impossible to tell just how those pages were used. It looks as if some thrifty copyist, a contemporary or slightly later fellow of the man who copied Fulgentius and Maxentius, saw an opportunity to insert another work of John's and to add in the remaining space a quotation from Ambrose. In order to account for the excerpt from the Western father we may speculate that it seemed appropriate to the copyist to bolster John's work with one of the great authorities of the West. After all, John's most important activities had concerned the Theopaschite controversy, Christological and Trinitarian in nature. What could be better than to quote Ambrose on substance, expecially since John's views had met their heartiest opposition in the West? [16]

[14] So I learned by consulting H. O. Coxe, Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Bodleianae, pars secunda, fascic. primus, 99, as the MS. itself was not available to me.

[15] This valuable information about Laud. Misc. 92 and 580 was derived from a letter of February 7, 1935 written by Dr. E. A. Lowe to Professor M. L. W. Laistner, who had made inquiries of Dr. Lowe on my behalf.

[16] The excerpt, unidentified by Coxe and not mentioned by Morin, was taken, I believe, from Ambrose's De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos, PL 17, 558 C–559 D. Coxe described the passage only as '*ex libro Sancti Ambrosii de Substantia*,' and quoted only the beginning and ending. He gives the beginning as, '*Ergo ipsum prodest hoc erit substantia ejus rei. . . .*" The De fide, PL 17, 558 C, begins '*Ergo ipsum quod est, hoc est substantia ejus rei, quae est . . .*,' etc. Coxe gives the ending as '*Secundum id quod*

In this connection it may be asked why the works of Maxentius are included in the same book with those of Fulgentius. It hardly seems mere coincidence that these two defenders of orthodoxy, who met on the common ground of opposition to Pelagianism and respect for Augustine, should be thus joined.[17] It is also noteworthy that the Scythians managed to win the Africans' support for their Christological and Trinitarian formula.[18] The Scythian monks moreover used the Latin language regularly; and consequently Ambrose, as well as Augustine, must have been high in their esteem. Since the disputes of the Scythians had centered on the hypostatic union, the opinion of Ambrose on substance was especially useful. If the copyist who inserted the writings of John of Tomi knew this — and he apparently knew that John of Tomi was John Maxentius — the addition of the Ambrose excerpt would be explained.[19]

John's *instructio* concerning the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies is very brief and simple, as it should be if it is the work alluded to by the Palatine collector. The Nestorians, who are taken up first, are disposed of in little more than eleven lines, while twenty-one are devoted to the Eutychians.[20] John's

---

indigna similitudine aestimari potest. . . .' The De fide, PL 17, 559 D has, '*Secundum id quod Deus est, condigna similitudine aestimari potest, quippe cum . . .*,' etc. Note that the quotation as given in Laud. Misc. 92 ended in the middle of a sentence. Strangely enough, however, the copyist stopped writing in the middle of the last line of the last page (folio 175^{v}).

[17] See Schwartz, ACO IV, 2, XIII, who makes the reasonable suggestion that all Maxentius's works were sent to Fulgentius, among whose works and papers they were found and copied by some thoughtful person.

[18] Ep. 16 and 17 among Fulgentius's letters, PL 65, 442–493. See also Duchesne, L'église au VIe siècle, 62–63.

[19] The interruption of the excerpt in the middle of a sentence poses several difficult questions. Was the sentence finished on the next folio? If so, why did the copyist stop in the middle of the last line on the page? Perhaps he found he had less space than he had calculated and thought it better not to begin on the final clause of the sentence. Were there other writings in the two missing folios, including some explanation of the works of John and Ambrose? The answers will probably never be known, but if the writings were continued on the next folio, it is very difficult to see why the copyist stopped where he did. On the other hand, Dr. Lowe remarked that the first folio of the quire, as well as the last two, is missing, causing a gap in the last work of Fulgentius. Since one inscribed folio apparently has been removed, others may have been too.

[20] JTS 7, 75–76. There is a point, small but not unworthy of mention in the dis-

description of the latter makes it possible to infer the date at which he wrote. He explains that some Eutychians maintain that the Son of God assumed His nature whence He wished, not from the flesh of the Virgin Mary, of our nature, that is, but yet passible, while others think He had a nature coeternal with heavenly and spiritual beings, and maintain that He passed through the womb of the Virgin Mary as water through a reed, assuming no flesh from her. John concludes by saying that all the Eutychians nevertheless agree that the Word and the flesh are of one nature by a wicked mixture and confusion.[21] Contemporaries of Maxentius indicate that the early sixth century was well aware of two groups of Eutychians. Boethius describes two possible views of the union of Christ's two natures in his Liber contra Eutychen et Nestorium.[22] Facundus also

---

course on the Nestorians. John announces that Nestorius '*adserebat sanctam virginem Mariam theodochon, non theotocon, hoc est susceptricem dei esse, non genitricem.*' Morin, in his *apparatus criticus*, p. 75, says of '*theodochon, non theotocon*' '*Cette formule est moins connue que l'autre,* χριστοτόκον *non* θεοτόκον. *On la trouve cependant dans le VII^e^ sermon de Nestorius*, n. 48 (Migne P. L. 48, 800): θεοδόχον *dico, non* θεοτόκον. *Cyrille d'Alexandrie la réfute dans sa lettre à ses clercs qui se trouvaient à Constantinople* (Migne, ibid., 815 sq.)' John's citation of this rare formula, which is to be found among the Nestorian and Cyrillan translations of Marius Mercator, forges yet another link in the chain of evidence binding the Palatine collector and John of Tomi.

[21] JTS 7, 76. '*Alii autem eiusdem perfidiae sectatores dicunt . quod filius dei non de Mariae uirginis carne hoc est nostrae naturae sed passibilem unde uoluit sibi adsumpsit . alii de caelestibus eum & spiritalibus coaeternam habuisse existimant. ac per uterum Mariae uirginis ueluti aquam per fistulam nihil ex ea carnis adsumens transisse contendunt . omnes tamen hi uerbum & carnem unius esse naturae impia permixtione con fusioneque confirmant.*'

[22] Cap. 7, pp. 100, 102, 120 of E. K. Rand's edition of the Opuscula Sacra in the Loeb Classical Library. Boethius is not here describing two sects of Eutychians but two interpretations of the heretical views of Eutyches. His discussion is nevertheless particularly significant, because these two views closely resemble those presented by John of Tomi. This similarity becomes even more striking in view of Father Schurr's contention that Boethius was stimulated to write his fifth theological tractate, the Liber contra Eutychen et Nestorium, by the famous letter addressed to Pope Symmachus by the Eastern bishops in 512. Boethius thought the controversy over the question '*ex duabus et in duabus naturis*' deserved much more attention than was given it. See Boethius, Tr. V, introduction, and Schurr, 124–125, 135–136. It may also be more than coincidence that in their letter the Eastern bishops complained that Catholics suffered at the hands of those who maintained that there was no middle way between Nestorius and Eutyches. This is very close to the complaint made by the Palatine collector, when he announced that it would be necessary to quote the words of John of Tomi. For the bishops' letter, see Thiel, ep. 12 of Symmachus, p. 714.

speaks of two kinds of Eutychians, those who follow Eutyches and the Acephali or Semi-Eutychians, who deny Christ's consubstantiality both with God and man.[23] And both groups are referred to in the Exemplum precum given in 520 to Justin by the people of Jerusalem and Antioch, who execrated all heretics, not only the Eutychianists and Acephali, but also the Nestorians.[24] Without pressing the subject further, it may be concluded that the two groups of Eutychians specified by John were the main body and the dissident group of the Acephali, who, in opposition to the leading Eutychians of the time, refused to support the Henoticon and whom Maxentius attacked in his Responsio contra Acefalos. Although there came to be many factions within the heresy, they had not taken on any great importance as early as the time of the Theopaschite struggle.[25] John of Tomi was interested merely in pointing out to the faithful that there were two varieties of Eutychians and that both were to be avoided.

Something more may yet be learned about the date of John of Tomi. Morin, believing that Mercator was responsible for the Palatine Collection, of course assumed that John must have been bishop of Tomi in the fifth century.[26] But if that position be maintained even now, we may join Father Schurr in asking why there is no mention of John of Tomi in any of the Scythian writers. He would obviously have been a source of strength to them in their struggle on behalf of orthodoxy and they

[23] Pro def. trium capit., I, 5, in PL 67, 548.

[24] PL 63, 503, and Collectio Avellana, CSEL 35, 704.

[25] For further information see Liberatus PL 68, 1034; Leontius Byzantinus, Confutatio utriusque fictionis inter se contrariae Nestorii et Eutychis, PG 86, 1351; Timotheus Presbyter, De iis qui ad ecclesiam accedunt, PG 86, 58; J. A. Dorner, Person of Christ, translated by D. W. Simon, div. II, vol. I, pp. 130 ff.; J. Pargoire, L'église byzantine (2nd edition, Paris, 1905), 30; A. Michel, 'Hypostatique (Union)' in DTC 7, 492.

[26] Morin, JTS 7, 77. If John had been bishop in the fifth century, it could only have been before the Council of Constantinople, early in 449, for Alexander was present both at that council and at Chalcedon. Alexander was followed by Theotimus in 458. Tillemont, 15, 141–142. If John had come so soon after Chalcedon, he would have mentioned the Council — only later did it become possible and fashionable in some circles to ignore it. If it is still held that John was bishop before 449, the defender of that view will face many difficulties, only one of which is the presence in the Palatine Collection of Dionysius's translations.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

would not have failed to cite him.[27] Moreover in describing the Eutychians John seems to infer that their heresy was one of long standing. Though it was later than 'others,' it far surpassed all in deceiving the faithful. He adds, 'For no plague has so prevailed against the church of Christ as this execrable superstition does up to the present.'[28] This refers surely not to the middle of the fifth century but to the sixth century crisis, when Maxentius was declaiming against the two heresies, aided by Dionysius Exiguus and the other Scythian monks.

It may at first seem strange that in his brief descriptions John gives the Eutychians almost twice as much space as the Nestorians, especially as both John Maxentius and the Palatine collector always demonstrated greater bitterness against Nestorianism. There is, however, no inconsistency here, for it is precisely because of the collector's absorption with the Nestorians that he appeals to John. Since most of the Palatine Collection was directed against Nestorian teachings at a time when both Eutychians and Nestorians were calling all who combated them by the name of the opposed heresy, as explained above, the collector could expect to be calumniated as a Eutychian. It was for protection against such a charge that he meant to quote the words of John of Tomi. Hence John's discourse gives more attention to the Eutychians than to the Nestorians. Indeed John may have composed his neat little definitions specifically for the need of his compatriot, the collector.

The collector's reference to the insidious custom whereby the Nestorians and Eutychians applied the name of the opposing heresy to all who tried to refute them, itself gives another indication of the date both of the collection and of John of Tomi. Fierce opposition in respect of Christological questions was as old as the formulation of the Antiochene and Alexandrine in-

[27] Schurr, 181.

[28] JTS 7, 76. '*Nulla namque pestis sic adversus ecclesiam praevaluit ut ista nunc usque superstitio exsecrabilis invalescit.*' Morin believed that, since John does not say Eutyches is dead, he must have been writing in the lifetime of the heresiarch. That does not follow, however, since there is no assurance from John that Apollinaris, who is also mentioned, is dead, nor is there any mention of Chalcedon for that matter.

terpretations of Christ's person and nature and the hatred of Eutychians and Nestorians for each other was always violent. But the practice of indiscriminately labelling all adversaries as members of the opposing heretical group appears to have flourished particularly in the early sixth century. Facundus of Hermiane used almost the same words as the Palatine collector when he said it was the custom of the Eutychians and Nestorians to charge those who refuted them with the opposite heresy.[29] That the same sort of reciprocal vituperation went on in Maxentius's time may be shown by his own works, for he referred to the dangerous theological confusion of his day and actually called Dioscorus, the unfriendly legate, a Nestorian.[30] There can be no doubt that the conditions described by the Palatine collector were those of Maxentius in 519–520.

That brings us to a final consideration of that mysterious bishop. He was a man of such standing that his definitions would have great authority; otherwise the collector would not have taken the trouble to refer to him. Since he could deal with such a parlous question as the two great heresies of the day, he must furthermore have been a theologian of recognized skill. We already know that he was a Scythian, like the collector, who called John 'our father' and who had access to the translations of Dionysius Exiguus, the most famous Scythian of all. Who could John of Tomi have been then but the Scythian John Maxentius, the ally of Justinian, the bitter foe of Nestorians and Eutychians, against whom he had inveighed with fervor and effectiveness in his theological polemics? When all these points are taken into consideration, it appears

[29] Pro def. trium capit., I, 2 in PL 67, 532–533. Cardinal de Noris in Dissertatio I, In historiam controversiae de uno ex trinitate passo, in his Opera omnia, 3 (Verona, 1729), 786 refers to the same condition in the time of the Emperor Anastasius I. See also the letter sent by Eastern bishops to Pope Symmachus, mentioned above. According to the Gesta de nomine Acacii, Mansi 7, 1061 and Col. Avel., CSEL 35, 443, at the time of the Robber Synod the Eutychians regarded all who disagreed with them as Nestorians, but this comment was written more than forty years after the Latrocinium.

[30] Dialogus contra Nestorianos, ACO IV, 2, 14 f. and Responsio adversus Hormisdae epistulam, ACO IV, 2, 47 and 52. In the Dialogus, 15, indeed he used language similar to that of the collector, saying of the Nestorians that he thought it necessary to expose their secret and wicked belief, which hides under cover of Catholic words. See also Dioscorus, Col. Avel., CSEL, 35, 224. The Scythian monks were accused of being Eutychian by the Acoemetae, de Noris, Dissertatio I, 797.

unquestionable that the inclusion of John of Tomi and the excerpt from Ambrose between the works of Fulgentius and John Maxentius could have been no coincidence.[31] It was the work rather of a learned man who realized not only that John of Tomi was John Maxentius but further appreciated the appropriateness of the excerpt from Ambrose, which he apparently selected for the purpose with great care.

The importance of these considerations for our undertanding of the Collectio Palatina is obviously very great. Schwartz's surmise as to the identity of John of Tomi is well borne out by the discovery of the lost '*sermones*.' It is established that John Maxentius became bishop of his home province of Scythia at some time in or after the year 520.[32] And it is demonstrated that the compilation in which John is mentioned was made not in the fifth but in the sixth century, at the time of the Theopaschite controversy in which the Scythian monks were so deeply involved.[33] Whatever the source and purpose of the collection may ultimately prove to be, it seems most likely that they will be close to those Gothic theologians whom Pope Hormisdas and his legates found so persistent and intractable.

This view of the meaning of the Palatine Collection conflicts sharply with Schwartz's theory as to its origin. Mercator's works in the collection are preceded by two documents concerning Rufinus and Origenism, and in Schwartz's opinion they indicate a connection with the Three Chapters dispute, which

[31] I do not argue for the omniscience of the copyist of John of Tomi in Laud. Misc. 92, but in these particular circumstances coincidence seems to me to be out of the question. Ordinarily it would be wiser to ask how the copyist knew, as in the incident mentioned by E. K. Rand in his review of Father Schurr's book, Speculum (1936), 153–156.

[32] The date is known because Paternus was still bishop in 520. Col. Avel., CSEL 35, 714. Schurr, 181, for some unexplained reason maintains that Maxentius could not have become bishop before 522.

[33] Nisters, 132–137, makes certain interesting but highly debatable and somewhat confused conjectures about the collection. He denies that Maxentius could have had anything to do with the collection, since it makes no mention of Chalcedon, while John was in favor of that council. I must confine myself at present to pointing out the citation of Cyril's anathemas in the translation of Dionysius Exiguus by both Maxentius and the Palatine collector. As for Maxentius's views on Chalcedon, the *suggestiones* of Dioscorus, the papal legate, to be found in the Collectio Avellana, CSEL 35, provide interesting reading on the subject. How Nisters would interpret the '*sermones*' of John of Tomi, it would be unfair to guess.

developed from Origenistic disorders in Palestine. In no other way, he believed, can the inclusion of anti-Origenistic works be explained.[34] Yet it would be very surprising indeed if two brief works were of such extreme importance as to determine the purpose of so large a collection. If the Origenistic element were as vital in the preparation of the Collectio Palatina as Schwartz thought, surely it would appear more prominently.[35]

How then is the presence of the two anti-Origenistic works to be explained? The answer is to be found by looking more closely at the writings themselves. The first one is a letter from Pope Anastasius I to Bishop John of Jerusalem, in which the pope deprecates the sympathetic attitude displayed in Rufinus's translation of Origen's heretical writings, and announces that he will not have these translations exerting their corrupt influence on the Romans.[36] The second document is a confession of faith, in which the confessor admits former errors which he now condemns.[37] Twelve anathemas follow, in which, according to de Noris, the errors of Origen are for the most part repudiated.[38] At the end of the *libellus* appear the words, in capital letters,

FINIT DE FIDE DE NOMINE RUFINI.[39]

Although this is not the most satisfactory identification of the author, it seems likely that the subscription either indicates a genuine confession by Rufinus or is meant to look as if it did.[40] The 'anti-Origenist' treatises then consist of Anastasius's

[34] Bay. Akad., 8–10.

[35] Nisters, 132, holds moreover that the Origenistic doctrines as they were debated in 532 and condemned in 543 were of a different kind from those in the Palatine Collection. Schurr, 181, censures Nisters for not doing justice to the 'strongly anti-Origenist' attitude of the collector, which led Schwartz to attribute the collection to the time of the Three Chapters controversy. But Schurr does not explain how these two treatises constitute a 'strongly anti-Origenist' attitude. If the collector had wished to combat Origenism, he could easily have done so much more effectively than by the inclusion of two insignificant writings from the beginning of the fifth century.

[36] ACO I, 5, 3–4.

[37] Ibid., 4–5.

[38] de Noris, Hist. Pel., 27.

[39] ACO I, 5, 5. Schwartz spaces the words as indicated.

[40] Cardinal de Noris, Hist. Pel., 26–27, did not hesitate to assign the confession to Rufinus. Can this *libellus* be the Apologia mentioned by Lietzmann in his article

letter condemning Rufinus's friendly interpretation of Origen and a confession in which someone, probably Rufinus himself, admits his former Origenist error and recants. This evidence hardly appears sufficient to stamp the compiler of a vast collection as strongly anti-Origenist in outlook and intent.

There is another explanation of the presence of these Origenistic writings at the head of the Palatine Collection. The first of Mercator's works, immediately following the *libellus de fide*, is a memoir against the *scripta* of Julian of Aeclanum.[41] Mercator began this essay by giving his account of the origin of the Pelagian heresy with Theodore of Mopsuestia. It was brought to the West in the time of Pope Anastasius by none other than Rufinus, who, realizing the danger of spreading the new doctrine, taught it to Pelagius. The heresy was passed on to Caelestius and then spread far and wide.[42] It seems likely, therefore, that the so-called anti-Origenistic documents are not directed so much against Origenism as against Rufinus, the disseminator in the West of the Pelagian teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The purpose was simply to vilify Rufinus by showing his earlier connection with the Origenist heresy. This interpretation, it may be added, argues for the incorporation of these works by Mercator rather than by the later collector. There is no explanatory comment concerning Origenism, but documents contained in collections of this period frequently lack much needed interpretation.

The first two works in the Palatine Collection, then, do not of necessity point to some obscure association with Origenistic disputes in the day of the Three Chapters. And even if these treatises were not brought into the collection by Mercator, it

---

'Rufinus 24,' Pauly-Wissowa, zweite Reihe, 1a, 1920, 1194, where he says, '*R. verteidigte sich in einer kurzen Apologia vor dem römischen Bischof Anastasius* (*403 Vall.*) *der aber in einem Schreiben an Johannes von Jerusalem den Origenes scharf verdammte, den R. seinem Gewissen überliess* (*408 Vall.*)'? The letter is unquestionably the one under observation here. It is not to be found among the letters of Anastasius in Thiel's Epistolae Romanorum pontificum.

[41] ACO I, 5, 5.

[42] ACO I, 5, 5–6. Mercator contemptuously described Rufinus as 'formerly a Syrian,' but since he added that Rufinus introduced the new doctrine in the time of Anastasius, there can be no doubt that this is Rufinus of Aquileia, the translator of Origen.

still must be explained how two works out of a great many reveal a fundamental interest in Origenism. The close relationship shown to exist between the Palatine collector and John Maxentius, the primary concern with Nestorianism, and the great interest in Pelagianism indicate rather that the collection dates from the period just before the Three Chapters controversy, when the Scythian monks were fighting for doctrinal unity.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY
ITS DEVELOPMENT, DIFFICULTIES AND VALUE

CANON R. D. RICHARDSON
HARBORNE, BIRMINGHAM

"The most ancient of the philosophers," wrote Clement of Alexandria, "were not carried away to disputing and doubting, and much less are we who are attached to the really true philosophy, and on whom the Scripture enjoins examination and investigation. . . . The point proposed for inquiry and answer knocks at the door of truth. . . . To those who thus ask questions in the Scriptures is granted that at which they aim, the gift of God-given knowledge, by way of comprehension, through the true illumination of their intellectual search. . . . It becomes him who is at once a lover and a disciple of truth to be pacific even in investigation, advancing by intellectual demonstration, without love of self but with love of truth, to the knowledge of comprehension." [1]

PERHAPS the only Father of the Church to have investigated the Doctrine of the Trinity in Unity with this disposition, — without love of strife or glory; and by this method, — examining, unfolding, and opening up the question by humble and honest interrogation; and thereafter to have received true knowledge as the prize, was St. Augustine. "Love is the charioteer," he truthfully says in the De Trinitate, of "my tongue" and "my pen" "yoked together"; and repeatedly he entreats friendly reproof of his "opinions." [2] And when he has reached the climax of his series of analogical trinities, he begs leave to finish his book "by a prayer better than by an argument," saying,

"I had indeed found in one person, such as is a man, an image of that Highest Trinity, . . . but three things belonging to one person cannot suit these Three Persons, as man's purpose demands. . . . Further, in that Highest Trinity which is God there are no intervals of time," such as are implied by the words, "the Son begotten" and "the Holy Ghost proceeding."

He would fain leave the task which, he says, has been so "wearisome" and, "to me, so difficult," and looks longingly towards that home of light where "there will be no place for inquiry." [3] Yet he declares that nonetheless he has touched the Eternal

[1] Misc., VIII, 1.
[2] III, Pref.; II, Pref.
[3] De Trin. XV, 45 and 51; II, 1; XV, 49.

Truth by faith. It is a noble book, this De Trinitate, and it shines. And if it does not achieve the consistency and coherence of a formal treatise on the Trinity in Unity, if indeed it confirms our misgivings concerning most such treatises, it accomplishes more than any in that, after reading it, "faithful piety burns" more eagerly "after those divine and unspeakable things which are above." [4] We return, as Augustine bids us return, to what Holy Scripture has to tell us, and set out again to explore the mysteries of God.

Augustine's proof- or problem-texts were of course these: "Baptise them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"; "God sent his Son"; and again, of the Holy Spirit, "Whom the Father will send in My name," but also, "Whom I will send unto you from my Father." [5] We are no longer hindered, as he was hindered, by the self-contradictions of a supposedly infallible Bible. The study of Scripture as it touches this high matter is not for us so "rough an exercise of the mind" as Augustine says that he found it before he could win "sweetness." Our difficulties are those inherent in an investigation into the nature of God, not those of reconciling text with text and dogma with Scripture. Moreover, we see that if the orthodox Fathers of the Church could defend the official doctrine from texts, so could Origen and Arius equally well defend from texts their differing Trinities of Subordinate Persons. Heretics and Fathers alike appealed to the New Testament; and they could do so for this reason, that New Testament reflection on the nature of God was in a fluid state, akin to their own experimental thinking. The one word by which Athanasius made the orthodox Doctrine of the Trinity finally possible — *homoousios* — is not to be found in Scripture at all. Even the word "Triad," or "Trinity," itself did not make its appearance in Christian Literature until the last quarter of the second century, when Theophilus of Antioch used it in his Epistle Ad Autolycum [6] to indicate a Trinity of "God, and His Word, and

[4] V, 2.

[5] Mt. xxviii, 19; Gal. iv, 4; Jn. ii, 17; xiv, 26, xv, 26. (De Trin. xv, 51.)

[6] II, 15.

His Wisdom." And as late as the end of the fourth century, Sozomen, in his account of Athanasius and Eusebius at the Council of Alexandria of 372 A.D., still thinks it worth while to mention that "they made use of the term 'Trinity.'" [7] All this shows the doctrine as developing; as being hammered out, in the Scriptures themselves and by the Fathers, for more than three centuries. New problems were presenting themselves to the mind as the inevitable result of the impact of history upon thought, and the effort of dealing with them added continually to the original revelation. In its complete formulation the doctrine is an alliance of the Greek intellectual awareness of a timeless Reality with the Christian's foundation of his religion in the time-lived life of Jesus. But the first disciples knew nothing of Greek philosophy. What they knew was the living core of Christianity, and this they themselves combined with Jewish thought. All that was of permanent value in their synthesis remained, to be fused in turn with the distinctive thought of Christians of other nations in days to come. What was transient in every stage in the development fell, or is falling, away.

It was the living core of Christianity that ultimately compelled a new interpretation of the nature of God. That living core is a religious experience, and it broke upon the world through the Life, Death and Resurrection of Jesus. It was first conveyed in such words as, "The Dayspring from on high hath visited us"; "God hath visited and redeemed His people"; "The Son of God loved me and gave Himself for me"; "The law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and of death"; "Ye received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." [8] What was permanent for systematic thought in these first expressions — springing from a Jewish background, yet forged anew, with differences, from a unique, complex, white-heat experience, and therefore full of the power of the unspoken word behind — was the triple verbal-vehicles, "Christ Jesus," "Father" and "Holy Spirit"; and the doctrine of the Trinity resulted from religious and speculative inquiry into the relation between the three aspects of the

[7] Hist. Eccl. V, 12.

[8] Luke i, 79, 68; Gal. ii, 20; Rom. viii, 2; II Cor. iii, 17.

divine nature represented by these terms. The problem was not invented, but was set by the experience. No doubt the Holy Spirit was not at first conceived of as a Person, as were Jesus Christ and God, but It was experienced as something personal, and to be filled with It was the principal characteristic of the primitive Christian. The Spirit had been poured out freely, as the prophets had anticipated that it would be, upon all believers; had ushered in the era of grace and truth as opposed to that of the Mosaic Law; and was felt as a new commandment in the inward parts. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you" [9] was probably the first approach to a formula; and if the Spirit (grace) is here not distinguished as Itself personal, the experience is the intimate one of a living relation, not the experience of an impersonal gift from Christ. Also, if God the Father is not mentioned in this early formula, neither is He meant to be excluded: He is still the ground of all religious thinking, for Christians as for Jews. From the very first, then, Christian experience was uniquely distinguished from all other religious experience, and whichever term or terms is, or are, not used in describing it, all three are implied. Soon there were formulae in use which mentioned explicitly all three, e.g. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all"; or, "through Christ we have access by one Spirit to the Father." [10] Even the final Trinitarian formula of the New Testament — "Into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" [11] — may have developed under purely Jewish-Christian influences and controversies.

[9] Cf. I Thess. v, 28 and I Cor. xvi, 23. Cf. also Baptism in the Name of Jesus only; e.g. Acts xix, 5.

[10] Cf. II Cor. xiii, 14; Ephes. ii, 18.

[11] Matt. xxviii, 19. Cf. Harnack, The Constitution and Law of the Church, App. II. Such expressions as "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with his Angels" (Matt. xvi, 27), and "Grace from Him which was and is and is to come . . . and from the seven spirits . . . and from Jesus Christ" (Rev. i, 4) represent other, not strictly Trinitarian lines of thought. They correspond with such threefold Jewish ideas as Yahweh, Yahweh's Work and Yahweh's People; or those of God and His Law given through Angels. In the Old Testament, so far as the Being of God is concerned, we never get beyond the stage of binitarianism, e.g. Yahweh and the Angel of His Presence; Yahweh and Messiah; Yahweh and His Spirit, or His Word, or His Wisdom.

To the threefold nature of the religious experience corresponded later the threefold philosophico-theological definition. Just as the profoundest religious experience was conveyed under three aspects to those who knew Jesus, so the profoundest speculation about the nature of the all-embracing Godhead must find a place for His relation to Himself (as Self-perceiving and as Self-perceived, as Self-loving and as Self-loved) and to the animate and inanimate existences which He has created. Indeed, in all subject-object relationships there is necessarily a third term, which resolves the dualism unifying the reality, and touches equally both the others. A Trinity in Unity is implied by religious experience and a Trinity in Unity is ultimately required by metaphysics. Nor can we conceive the addition of a fourth term in either case; it would not enrich the experience and it would introduce chaos into the thinking. The inescapable problem is that of bringing the two Trinities together, of reaching such an understanding of the nature of God as is suggested both by religion and by philosophy; and the history of that problem is the history of the first centuries of the Christian era. Yet inasmuch as "God is the beginning of religion and the end of philosophy," it was nearness to the full and genuine Christian experience that governed throughout all that was valuable in the growing solution of the problem. Great doctrine is the echo of great souls; it is the poetry that tells of life. Such poetry is the doctrine of the Gospels. Poetry it often remains while Christians speculate on the Trinity during the first three centuries. And poetry do even expositions of the later doctrine of the Trinity in Unity become when such as Augustine are pouring out the fullness of their great hearts.

There is, then, a world of difference between the doctrine of the Trinity as it leaves the lips of those who had experienced a conversion and of those who had not. And broadly speaking, this is the difference between the doctrine of the Trinity in the ante- and the post-Nicene ages. The ante-Nicene Fathers were converted heathens proclaiming vehemently their secret, and proclaiming its pure operations in the various and peculiar modes of thought which characterized their former habits of thinking, — "John" the Evangelist, Justin Martyr,

Theophilus, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian; to whom, from a later age, may be added Augustine. But in the later, fully-formulated, doctrine the power is dimmed by the multitude of careful words. The post-Nicene Fathers had been brought up in the Church, inheriting the doctrine as it had now passed into the tradition, their anxious thought directed to its exact intellectual statement, — Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Leo the Great; to whom, from a later age, may be added Abelard and Aquinas. Note even the exceptions: The ante-Nicene Origen, whose doctrine is linked with the flow of later speculation, had been brought up a Christian, while the post-Nicene Augustine had been converted. These two souls, each separated in this way from his contemporaries, confirm the broad difference in Trinitarian doctrine which results from the manner of approach. So too, does Athanasius, the link between the ante- and the post-Nicene groups. Philosophical as is the form of his thinking, it is governed by redemptive and poetic strains, and we are not surprised to discover that his education was that of a Greek, whilst martyr-teachers instructed him during his teens, no doubt awakening the strong emotional element at work in his writings. All this does not mean that speculation made no contribution to the gains of religious knowledge; nor that it is better to undergo conversion than to have been reared inside the Church; but that the richer the contribution to the truth, the more practical the doctrine and the nearer to the deeply moved heart. In the last resort it is heart which makes the theologian; and the deepest insight into spiritual truths is given to the experience of the whole man rather than to the efforts of intellectual penetration out-distancing the rest.

Just as the Trinitarian experience of the New Testament arose from contact with Jesus in His earthly life and with His Risen Spirit, so the Trinitarian definitions in theology grew out of a doctrine concerning the Incarnate Word. The Church's doctrine of the Trinity is rooted in the doctrine of the Incarnation; so that if the latter is imperfectly conceived, difficulties must arise in the former. Here indeed lies the cause of all the

Trinitarian controversies, nor could more than a provisional solution of them come into sight at the time when these controversies raged. What we have to note now, however, is the emergence of the first developed doctrine of the Incarnation, viz. that of the Fourth Gospel.

The religious experience of its author, who belonged to the second generation of Christians, when deepened and enlarged by his reflection upon it acquired a universal aspect and became more mystical and metaphysical than that of the first disciples. In the beautiful High-Priestly Prayer, he portrays the anguish of One Who had spiritual Oneness with God and, being about to close His earthly life and part from those He had so hardly trained, looked back on the significance of His mission for mankind, both with longing that the work might not prove vain when He Himself was no longer visible on earth and also with a deep sense of His own mystical life whose purpose was ordained from all eternity:

"As thou didst send me into the world, even so sent I them. . . . As thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, that they also may be in us, . . . that they may be perfected into one. . . . Father, those whom thou hast given me, I will that, where I am, they also may be with me: that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." [12]

The sphere of the operation of the (here un-named) Holy Spirit is redeemed humanity,[13] and the link between it and Jesus of Nazareth is the Risen and Glorified Christ. From this moving language of religion, in which "John" reveals how the first disciples' sense of personal redemption has been enlarged in him into a profounder sense of a divine mission to all mankind, it was but a step, for one conversant with Greek thought, to the language of philosophy. "John" proceeded to identify the Redeemer with the eternal law of the world, the Logos. This doctrine was already implied in the later Pauline thought and summed up there in one inspired sentence: He is "the image of the Invisible God, the first-born of all creation; . . . all things have been created through Him, and unto Him; and He is before all things, and in Him all things consist." [14] The Johannine

[12] Jn. xvii, 18, 21, 23 f. [13] Cf. p. 124 of this paper. [14] Col. i, 15 f.

thought identified Jesus explicitly with the philosophic Logos, and the Evangelist found himself irresistibly compelled to write a version of the Gospel in which the Jesus of history is continuously interpreted as the moving Image of the Eternal Christ: Jesus could not for him be fitted properly to any of the existing interpretations, — of prophet, or high-priest, or even Messiah or Son of God. Thus was the Jewish conception of God as working in and through history finally challenged by Jesus to a philosophical conclusion in the doctrine of the Truth of God incarnate, of the "Word made flesh." It is true that in the Fourth Gospel the historic figure is presented as less fully human than in the Synoptic Gospels; but that was inevitable at the time, and it remains a fact that it was the Figure Who actually appeared in Palestine Who eventually compelled the estimate of Himself in cosmic terms.

In reaching this estimate of Jesus, the Evangelist added something, not only to current Jewish and Christian thought, but also to current Greek philosophy, whose most popular systems in his day were Platonism and Stoicism. In Platonism, the idea of the Logos was potentially present; but Plato did not use the word, and his conception was of something static, of an infinite Idea eternally filling the mind of God. In Stoicism the Logos was thought of as dynamic, as the animating energy of the universe. Alexandrine thought had already effected a fusion of these theories, so that the creation could be thought of as God's great act to express His infinite Idea: while Hellenistic Jews had half-personified the Heavenly Wisdom by picturing it as God's coadjutor in His creative task.[15] It was this idea of the Heavenly Word, or the Eternal Christ, that was now applied to Jesus: the Heavenly Word proceeding forth, whilst yet not leaving His Father's Self, and becoming the Life of all that is and the inner Light of every man, shone finally, full-orbed, in Jesus Christ.

As a result of John's penetrating recognition of faith, through which Jesus was interpreted by him in terms of the Logos, it became possible for those preoccupied with thoughts about the Logos to interpret It in terms of Jesus. Accordingly, the

[15] Cf. Prov. viii; Wisdom, vi–ix.

religious temper of the Greek-speaking world now began to be transformed as thoroughly as the religious temper of the Jewish world had previously been transformed. What had been done for an eschatological religion was now done for a philosophic one; and it was followed by the same characteristic experience of rebirth. Read for example the Clementine Homilies,[16] which a century later revealed the pinings and the pathos of those in the grasp of contending systems of philosophy; and contrast with them such contemporary documents as Clement of Alexandria's Exhortation to the Heathen, in which the idea of the "Word made flesh" has become the source of joy and all true confidence:

"Inasmuch as the Word (which) was, and is, the divine Source of all things . . . has now assumed the name of Christ, He has been called by me the New Song. (We look upon) Truth's shining face." "Error seems old, but truth seems a new thing." [17]

Conversion and redemption were the notes, and the key rose continually into poetry.

"The Word of truth and wisdom," exclaimed Justin Martyr, "burning and shining brighter than the sun, penetrates the inmost depths of heart and soul. . . . Gladly would I impart to all the same disposition which I now possess." [18]

But Justin still wore the distinguishing square cloak of the philosopher, and by it proclaimed his freedom to bring the thought of his former philosophical teachers into the service of Him Who had inspired them; for were not all who lived according to Reason Christians before Christ? [19] So we now meet, not only the Johannine master-thought about the Logos, but also the idea of it as derived from the divine *ousia*, as fire is kindled from fire. With the introduction of this term, controversial even in the time of Plato,[20] there entered into Christianity some pagan tendencies from which Christ had delivered men but which they could not quickly cast away. The Divine Father was spoken of Platonic-wise by Justin, and by his successor Athenagoras, as incomprehensible, impassible, and un-

[16] Homily I.
[17] Ch. I.
[18] Trypho, 121.
[19] Apol. I, 46 and II, 13.
[20] Cf. Soph. 246.

knowable to all save the Son.[21] Nor could Justin — and the second century Apologists in general — altogether escape the idea of the Logos as a second God; [22] which presently caused a reaction towards uncompromising monotheism, to the doctrine of the divine *monarchia*. Yet Greek Christians could not rest content with definitions of a bare unity in God, such as those presented in the unknown and unknowable Immensity postulated by oriental religions, or in the God of Judaism. Their specific Christian experience, insistent and indomitable, was thereby left an unrelated factor in their knowledge of the Creator. They pressed on to a fuller doctrine of the Godhead. A ground of all Being must in some way be linked to the divine transcendence. And not only Christian experience, but Neo-Platonic philosophy also, now tended to the conclusion that God and the world are bound together in a close, organic unity.

It was Origen who, at the turn of the second century, forged the necessary link, and he did so as an Alexandrian Platonist instructed in the Christian faith. His special contribution, in the first half of the third century, was the theory of the "Eternal Generation of the Word." He urged that existence-in-relationship is of the essence of Deity: God, from all eternity, communicates Himself to the Logos; Light, Life and Grace go forth from Him eternally and constitute the blessedness of creation.[23] On such a view, not only a stark monotheism but Gnostic theories also, with their idea of the creation as evil, were rejected. But Origen accomplished more than this. His was the first systematic philosophical theory, a doctrine of the Divine Being in relation to the world and to man, scrupulous in its attention to the Bible and concerned with the whole of contemporary knowledge. The divine extends to the creaturely; Jesus Himself has a human soul; the Logos, incarnate in Him, is revealed also in all spiritual intelligences. Origen has a doctrine of the Trinity too, in which the Logos, as the creative principle of the world, is subordinate to the Father, and

[21] Apol. II, 10; Dial. 127, 128, etc. Athenagoras, Apol. 10. Even later Christian thought never quite eradicated this.

[22] Cf. Justin Apol. I, 13: "We reasonably worship Him, having learned that He is the Son of the true God Himself, and holding Him in the second place."

[23] Cf. De Princ. I, i, 6, 8; ii; iii; IV, i, 36; etc.

in which the Spirit, as the sanctifying principle of mankind, is subordinate to the Son; and this, as well as justifying it at the bar of reason, Origen justifies also at the bar of Scripture: "My Father is greater than I"; "I will send another Comforter." All later philosophic-theologians had to go to Origen and use his thought in constructing their own doctrines of the Trinity, the Cappadocian Fathers no less than Arius. And yet, — in spite of its comprehensiveness, its magnificence, its accuracy of thought, it did not do justice to the full Christian experience. It was the best that could then be done to present Christianity as a knowledge as well as a faith, but faith still challenged it to a fuller perfection. So we find others, with less learning than Origen, arriving at a doctrine of a Trinity more satisfying to the religious consciousness and more like to that ultimately developed as Orthodoxy: principally his contemporary Tertullian, who wrote the first systematic treatise on the Trinity. He was one who knew the transforming power of Christianity; he had experienced a conversion to the Lord as Spirit. "The Holy Spirit descends with joy from the Father to rest upon the purified and the blest," [24] he says, in speaking of Holy Baptism, which, in his own life, had meant so much to him. Until his time, Christian thought had been preoccupied with the doctrines of God and of Christ, and this was to continue for more than another century, so that Tertullian is aside from the main stream of thought; but Tertullian is interesting as anticipating later thought through his faithfulness to the direct touch of the Spirit upon his soul.[25] And no full doctrine of the Trinity would have been possible without a doctrine of the Spirit.

Actually it was Athanasius who, at the beginning of the fourth century, presented the main challenge of religion to philosophical theory, not in the person of its great representative, Origen, but in the person of Arius. Arius had made use of the

[24] De Bapt. 8.

[25] The doctrine of the Spirit was not developed forthwith because of the excesses of the Montanists, due to their claims to special inspiration. Tertullian arrived at the idea of one substance in diversity in the Godhead; but his thought on the Spirit was not consistent. He spoke of it sometimes as a Person, sometimes as a Power within the Deity. No doubt it was because the doctrine of the Spirit had not yet become a living issue that Clement of Alexandria never dealt with the doctrine of the Trinity.

subordinationist elements in Origen's all-embracing system to construct his own academic one. With reference to the Trinity, "there is a Triad," he said, "not in equal glories"; [26] and in this Triad the Logos-Christ was presented as a created being, meant to bridge the gulf between the world and God, Whom Arius held strenuously to be of purer Being than could be communicable. Instinctively the whole force of Athanasius' religious nature was aroused. "In the Son we have the Father": [27] that was his whole soul's cry, and nothing could turn him aside from that one true thought of faith. All the acuteness of his mind was directed to supporting it. God alone is to be adored, he argued, yet we must fain adore Christ Jesus. Therefore His Godhead is proved: He must share in the divine essence. So the word *homoousios* was wrung out of a soul who had found salvation. The divine in Christ was not for him primarily the Life-principle of the world but its Redeeming principle. And a quarter of a century later, when his thought had been turned that way, he asserted likewise the *homoousios* of the Holy Spirit given to believers: the Spirit which redeems must also be of the Godhead and, therefore, worshipped.[28] Athanasius' strength and importance lie entirely in the manner in which he clung to these beliefs dictated by his spiritual insight. No matter what confusion they seemed to introduce into accurate thinking; no matter that the Christ now became an almost wholly transcendental Figure; no matter what an overthrow was caused in the system of Christian thought on the relation of God to the world; no matter even what tradition had to say: for in his determination to speak as plainly as possible the religious truth that he had seen Athanasius actually introduced a word which was unknown in the tradition, and by the strength of his vision compelled the Church to accept it.

For the rest, Athanasius has a rational, though experimental, theology. God, the mysterious Background of existence, he tells us, is yet Love, and Communicable Love. In His Son or Second Self, the Logos, who became incarnate, He sees His own perfect "Reflection"; and by the Son all things visible and in-

[26] Quoted by Athanasius, De Syn. 15.

[27] Orat. I, 12, 21.

[28] Athanasius was as much a Sabellian as an Apollinarian, but he saved Monotheism.

visible are created and stamped with a divine impress; the world gives forth His music: "He handles the universe as a lyre"; and again, Himself unfolds within all things, like the light of the sun irradiating and penetrating all. The Spirit, which is the Life of the Father and the Son as they are bound together in perfect unity and charity, abides in humanity, and, saving and sanctifying, "knits us into the Godhead." [29] In such descriptions, religion, philosophy and poetry are joined; the thinking is exact, but there is freedom in the use of words.

It remained for the three Cappadocian Fathers, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil the Great and his brother Gregory of Nyssa, to bring these different strands in Athanasius' thought together, and to construct anew a philosophical theology, — not without the aid of that of Origen. The main result of Athanasius' life-work, as affecting systematic thought, was to turn it to consideration of *how* there could be three Subjects — *hypostases* — in the one nature — *ousia* — of the Godhead. Whereas Athanasius insisted for religion's sake on the equal Godhead of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, thought now had to descry the manner in which there could be Three in One. Here was scope indeed for a whole new discipline. The problem was no longer primarily one of the nature of God in relation to the world and to the soul of man, but of God as He is in Himself. Hence the doctrine of the Trinity now became a Mystery, *the* Mystery of the Faith. A doctrine of, as it were, Trinity in-relation-to-the-world was replaced by a doctrine of transcendent Trinity. Yet having defined the divine modes of existence and their characteristics, it was, nevertheless, possible to try to relate their activities to the spheres of creation and human experience. Thus, in the same way that the divine Father is the Ground and First-principle of the Godhead, so, it was maintained, is He also the Ground and Cause of all creation. Likewise, the Eternal Begetting of the Son from the Father within the Godhead was held to have a parallel in the creative process; — although the idea of the creation as itself eternal was rejected, and thought on the Incarnation was that of the appear-

[29] Cf. C. Gentes, 42; 44; De Incar. Verbi, 8; 18; Orat. c. Arianos, III, 22–25.

ance on earth of the Second Person of the Trinity. Again, the Eternal Procession of the Spirit within the Godhead was held to have its parallel in the communication of divine grace to human souls; — although those who could receive it were held normally to be those only within Christ's Body, the Catholic Church. These limitations, so fruitful of difficulties, were inevitable at the time because Christians had no satisfactory doctrine either of man or of matter.

For want of these, the Incarnation could not be conceived of as a final revelation of God in human personality. Since Christ was of the essence of the Godhead, it followed for thought that His centre of consciousness must be divine; though an intuition of faith struggled against this logical conclusion, asserting that He was "born of the Virgin Mary," i.e. He was truly man, and "perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting." [30] An unsatisfactory doctrine of the relation of soul to body [31] made it possible, however, to shirk the difficulty that the possession of two perfect natures must involve the possession of two centres of personality. If Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature, as the Gospel says, this could be held to mean that in Him the divine more and more irradiated the flesh, as the sunshine touches the mountain peak and gradually spreads to the whole landscape. The divine was indeed thought of as projecting itself necessarily, as does light. But the analogy, we see, is not perfect. The revelation of the divine in the human involves, on the part of the latter, effort and struggle, because of man's freedom. It involves a free laying hold of the light, not only its reception, by acts of will. This service of God, Jesus plainly rendered to Him. The centre of His personality was human. And we must think of the Logos as the divine personal activity which has revealed itself progressively in creation and in man, and finally and supremely in Jesus. The order of nature and the soul of man are both within the Logos without contradiction; the soul is the middle term which binds the Logos and

[30] With the Creeds compare also the Chalcedonian Definition.

[31] In Hebrew thought, man was a body animated by a semi-physical spirit. In Greek thought, man's spirit was caged in the body like a bird.

the realm of matter together. Hence the soul is the highest sphere for us of the divine Revelation; and this makes it possible to conceive how the divine was revealed fully in the soul of Jesus. The Incarnation is the fulfilment of a world-process: and it requires no accompanying miracle, representing an incursion into the natural order, to have accomplished it. This was necessary for thought only so long as the accepted doctrine of nature was one which set it wholly over against God, and the accepted doctrine of man one which set him wholly in material nature. But the perfect Divinity and the perfect Humanity of Jesus are both safeguarded without it, and on such a view of the Incarnation as is here outlined, the doctrine of the Trinity is freed from the semblance of tritheism which must always beset it so long as the Subject of the mental life of Jesus and the Second Person of the Trinity are identified; for this identification makes it inevitable to think of there being more than one Mind in the Godhead. The Logos can still be thought of as wholly incarnate in Jesus; not however as exclusively incarnate in Him.

As touching next the doctrine of the Spirit, so long as it was held that there was nothing divine in man except that he was created by God, it was impossible to think of him as one who could receive so high a thing as a divine Revelation: the impact of the Spirit must be something that did violence to his nature, the operation of a divine activity from outside his soul. Parallel therefore with the mystery of the modes of existence of the divine Persons, the Church developed its sacramental system, by which the *gifts* of the Spirit were held to be conveyed through consecrated, institutional channels; and it came more and more to think of itself as the Fellowship of those who shared in these mysteries. The larger view of the Church as the Fellowship of all who are disciples of Christ, and through Him have received the Spirit "for consolation and sanctification and perfection," [32] began to decline: likewise reflection on the office of the Spirit in relation to the world. Yet not entirely. The Creed called "Nicene" conceives of the Spirit as acting at certain *points* throughout creation and human life. He is the Lord and

[32] Cf. The Second Creed of Antioch.

Life-giver, Who brooded over the primeval, formless "deep"; He "spake by the prophets"; He governs the "One, Catholic Apostolic Church"; can touch and transform every human nature in Baptism; will breathe on the "dry bones" in the grave at the looked-for "resurrection of the dead" and usher in "the life of the world to come." All this bears witness to the feeling after a doctrine of universal Spirit. And where religious experience was allowed to speak, there, as ever, a great thought of faith leapt into being. The addition of the "filioque" clause to the Creed was the new revelation in this case. Those who recognized the Spirit's touch upon their souls knew the Spirit to be both of God and of Jesus; not proceeding from the Father through the Son, as more logical thought would then have it (since the Father alone is the root of the Godhead and the other Persons are caused), but proceeding equally from both. To this certainty of religion the theology of the West bowed. Similarly, St. Gregory of Nazianzus made a rich contribution to the doctrine of the Spirit while he was engaged in winning souls for Christ at Constantinople, and, apparently, valuing discipleship above correct opinion. "Now the Spirit Himself dwells among us, and supplies us with a clearer demonstration of Himself . . . that by gradual additions and risings and advances from glory to glory, the light of the Trinity might shine upon the more illuminated." [33] Here is a truth which we are only now beginning properly to understand, viz. that Revelation is progressive, and that *all* our additions and advances in truth and holiness represent a growth of humanity in the life of the Spirit. Mankind does not attain redemption through incorporation into a divinely-founded Institution; but the life of God as Spirit is being manifested progressively in and to humanity as an actual possession, and all who recognize this constitute the Church. The highest part of man's nature is spiritual, or this would not be possible: God is not external to man. And when his soul rises above itself and becomes spirit he has contact with the divine Spirit, Who is to be thought of as super-individual, though not as impersonal; rather, as more fully personal because super-individual. The Holy Spirit, says

[33] Orat. de Spir. Sanct. xxvi.

Dr. Inge, is "not so much a part of ourselves as a divine Life which we may share." [34] There is indeed, as the New Testament itself tells us, only *one* Spirit; but that divine Life is shed abroad in all our hearts, and we can all be conscious partakers of It; yet fully-conscious partakers only through Christ, Who is permanently oned with the Spirit.

The Holy Spirit is God Himself: not a gift from God mysteriously infused into the soul, nor a separate divine Being. Insofar as we may legitimately distinguish the Spirit from God, He is God's Presence-made-known, intuitively and unselfconsciously perceived and recognized and possessed. In this sense, God as Being is prior to God as Spirit.

Here we find too a clue to that difference between the Logos and the Spirit which the Greek theologians were ever seeking to grasp and define. The sphere of the Logos is that of the divine creative activity at work in the universe and in the soul of man. The sphere of the Spirit is the glad recognition of that Source of Life, and the will's obedience to it. Everything that God has made shines back to Him, is instinct with the praise of His glory.[35] But only man can render perfect praise. Transformed in the spirit of his mind, he can, with unveiled face, reflect as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, and offer too, as joyful worship, the reasonable service of his soul and body. But only when the spirit within him has been kindled into light and love in every man, only when mankind has been led into all Truth, and only when all men have become Christ's disciples and live together in the concord of a perfect and immortal life, will the Spirit have achieved His fullest operation. Then God will be fully known, and adored in all the fulness of His Being and Perfections. The Trinity disclosed to us by God's Revelation of Himself in creation, in Christ and in our own spirits will be acknowledged as the transcendent Trinity of the one God as He is in Himself.

The difficulties of working out the correspondence between the modes of existence and relationships within the Godhead

[34] The Philosophy of Plotinus, Vol. II, p. 38.

[35] Cf. Henry Suso's beautiful meditation on the *Sursum Corda*.

and the spheres of the creation and human experience, caused the later Fathers — restricted as they were by their presuppositions about the nature of the world and of man — to turn more and more to the doctrine of God as He is in Himself. And as they became absorbed in the mystery of the Threefoldedness of the Godhead, speculative mysticism tended to replace the mysticism borne of the distinctive Christian experience. Nevertheless, the Christian doctrine of God as He is in Himself — contained in the Athanasian Creed and in the Chalcedonian Definition — has great values. The dangers are great, the difficulties great, the contradictions — inherent in speaking of things beyond all human understanding — are irreconcilable and baffling; and the Church lays itself open to the charge that it is grasping after something more real than Reality.[36] Harnack tells a story of an old man who lived in ignorance, dirt and wretchedness, and whom God told that he might wish for anything he liked and it would be given him. And the man began to wish for ever more and higher things, and all were given him. At last he became presumptuous, and wished he might become like God himself; when instantly he was back in all his dirt and wretchedness.[37] This story Harnack likens finally to the attempt of Christians to become as God Himself in beatitude and insight, and there is much to justify the comparison. We watch, in the fourth century, the subtly speculative element in Christianity rapidly increasing in the efforts of the later Fathers, now using philosophy as the handmaid of theology, to distinguish three hypostatical existences or personal subsistences within the one *ousia*; and, at the same time, we see Christianity taking on the appearance of a pagan religion in its cultus and practice. There pass before our eyes pictures of strange anchorites in the Egyptian desert. We feel too the coldness of the light which dazzles the purest contemplatives of the Absolute, so that we reach out instinctively for the warmth of the religion of the Incarnation. Finally, we remember that this absorption with the Being of God as He is in Himself resulted in a conviction that no other knowledge matters: the founda-

[36] A. S. Pringle-Pattison, The Idea of God, p. 314.

[37] History of Dogma, Vol. IV, p. 268.

tions of scientific curiosity were sapped, and for a long period a thick pall of darkness lay upon the human mind. While wars and barbarism swept over Europe, the otherworldly values alone remained. Christ in judgment, and the Church as the ark of Salvation, and faith and observances — not inquiry and love — dominated men's thoughts. Only so long as the doctrine of the Trinity remained a doctrine of God in relation to the world and to human life was Christianity truly a knowledge, in which all other knowledge was fructified by the flow of its teaching.

And yet, — with shades of the prison-house thus falling upon us, and with full knowledge of what can be the results of abstract speculations, — we note a corresponding set of dangers in renouncing completely the sublime quest which the very thirst which we have for God both indicates and lays upon us. Granted that the God Who — from a very necessity of His Nature as Love — has made us, and made Himself known to us, must be a different God from One Who should do neither of these things: yet, if the word "God" has no meaning except in relation to the world and to our own experience, and if all knowledge is nothing but empirical, then is it not possible to end by making God's existence itself dependent upon the existence of the world, or even of our own minds? [38] Such dangers have been present to Christian thought ever since Origen laid it down that existence-in-relationship is the essence of the divine Nature, and they have passed into commonplace assertion to-day.[39] Modern science, e.g., seems to point to the conclusion that matter is eternal. A religious concordat with this belief might be made on the ground that it agrees well with the idea of the divine Agent in creation as being eternally generated by the Father. St. Thomas Aquinas himself — as well as Origen — felt the force of that solution; but he was unable to accept it.[40] The religious consciousness can in fact never be fully satisfied except it be certain that we are in no wise neces-

[38] Cf. v. Hügel, Essays and Addresses, Vol. II, pp. 149 ff.

[39] They were really excluded by Nicene Trinitarianism, built as it was upon the thought of Christ as the Incarnate Logos of transcendent Deity, as Risen also, and Glorified.

[40] S. Theol., xlvi, Second Argument.

sary to God's existence and that God minus the world would still equal God. This position, the metaphysical doctrine of the Trinity defends. For the rest, the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed was meant to be held in conjunction with the distinctive Nicene doctrines of God, Christ and the Holy Spirit, as these proceeded more directly from factual experience. It could not indeed have come into existence until these last had been formulated. Then there was added to them the crowning and safeguarding doctrine of God as He is in Himself, based upon experience of another order, the mystic's experience of deep joy in adoration of the Divine Perfections. Both of St. Thomas Aquinas' splendid Summae betray, throughout their searching and relentless inquiry, an intellectual passion born of worship. While deliberately held on the plane of dialectical argument, they are instinct with the longing to behold the eternal Vision unveiled, and with the trust that the exercise of man's reason is itself the fulfilment of a divine law. All intensity of thinking, indeed, has its value in the spiritual life; and, as Rashdall said,[41] "In all true thinking there is a reproduction of the divine thought." Undoubtedly there have been phases of Christian thought since the formulation of the Nicene doctrine, in which teaching on the Trinity has represented, as Professor Pringle-Pattison maintains, a desire "to try to get beyond or behind the ultimate, to project a more abstract God behind the living God, as somehow bringing the latter into being." [42] But there is more in the Church's greatest speculative flight than the inveterate tendency of young children to insist, "Who made God?"

The metaphysical doctrine of the Trinity defends, first and foremost, the profound truth, so necessary for religion, that "God is *the* Subject, *the* Person Who establishes Himself and is founded on Himself." [43] The orthodox insistence that He is one Mind indicates of course that He is a self-conscious and determinate Being, and in this sense a Person, as personality

[41] God and Man, p. 72.

[42] Op. cit., p. 313.

[43] Karl Barth, Gifford Lectures, 1937–38, pp. 31 f.

is known to us. But the proposition that He is also "Three Persons" — since in theology "Person" connotes neither a person like ourselves nor a mere attribute of personality — conveys the meaning that God is also the Fount of personality, in all — and more — of the fundamental aspects of it that we are able to conceive.[44]

Secondly, the propositions that the Son is eternally "begotten" of God, and that the Holy Spirit eternally "proceeds" from both, stand for the principle that God's nature includes the expression of Himself in objective activity. God's nature is infinitely rich, self-sufficing and blessed. The popular "social" explanation of the Trinity used to illustrate this divine property is unsatisfactory, involving as it does a plurality of persons in the Godhead: the Trinity may not be thought of on the analogy of three human individuals bound together by love in a perfect society. It is more satisfactory to explain God's self-consciousness, and self-sufficingness and inner blessedness by tracing differences in the Godhead, as Gregory of Nyssa was the first to do,[45] to psychological moments in the Mind of God. There is a true analogy between the threefold Divine Unity and the unity of the human mind, in which we can distinguish between the thinker, his thought and his judgment on that thought; although this can fall far short of the truth concerning God, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit may thereby seem to correspond with only an abstract relationship in Him. If however we emphasize that the thinker's judgment of his thought is also the glad recognition of it as the perfect expression of his deepest Self, this makes the analogy the most perfect we can find. If the Son, in metaphysical thought, is the objective creation of an activity without which a divine Self-consciousness were impossible, then the Spirit is the Power and the Joy ("Smile"

[44] These are the kind of difficulties which Aquinas had in mind when he said: "By natural reason we can know what belongs to the unity of the Essence, but not what belongs to the distinction of the Persons. Whoever, then, tries to prove the Trinity of Persons by natural reason derogates from faith. . . ." (S. Theol., xxxii, 1). It is worth stressing, however, that it is the mystery of the Divine Being, not the doctrine of the Trinity, that cannot be grasped by the intellect. The doctrine itself was indeed framed by the intellect.

[45] De An. et Res. (Argument).

would convey the meaning more accurately) with which He recognizes that Object and that Object reflects Him. And It is spoken of as a "Person," rather than as a "Power," to signify the apotheosis of the divine Beatitude.[46]

Thirdly, in the very heart of the metaphysical formulation is still strongly set and asserted the humanity of Jesus: "Not two, but one Christ; One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking of the Manhood into God; One altogether . . . by unity of Person." The sublime thought here conveyed is best expressed by Dante in his description of the Vision that crowned his ascent, when, "in that exalted lustre's deep, clear ground, methought that I beheld three circles glow."

> O light that aye sole in Thyself dost bide,
> sole knowest Thyself and, being Self-understood,
> and knowing dost love Thyself, Self-satisfied!
> That circle which appeared in thee endued
> with a reflected radiance, when I turned
> to scan awhile its shape and magnitude,
> of that same hue with which it inly burned
> seemed painted in the likeness of a man;
> to solve which wonder my whole spirit yearned.[47]

In trying to solve the problem, Dante says, he fixed his whole intent upon this mystery, as the geometrician tries in vain to measure the surface of the circle. And then, a sudden flash, and insight came. The great Vision lasted but one second; but when he had returned to this created world — all of whose separate existences, like "leaves through all creation strewed," he had seen "bound in a single volume" "by the might of love" — his spirit too surrendered to the universal law, and he became impelled by "the Love that moves the sun and all the stars." The humanity of Jesus, enshrined within the metaphysical statement of the Christian faith, insists that God's Nature and His Name is Love. The whole great Cosmos moves by the Spirit Who lived on earth in Jesus.

Fourthly, the Athanasian symbol points to worship. There comes a point where knowledge must give place to Vision; when thought must cease to proceed from ourselves before the

[46] Cf. pp. 124–125 of this essay.

[47] See Paradiso, xxxiii, 108 to end. (Translation by G. L. Bickersteth.)

undisclosed Mystery of God. Speculation on the Being of God has thus its proper end in mystical contemplation and adoration: "The Catholic Faith is this: that we *worship* One God in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity."

Fifthly, the actual formulation of the doctrine bears witness to the reconciling and inclusive nature of Christianity, for it represents an ingathering of different types of thought. No single, received, coherent Christian philosophical system existed until the end of the Dark Ages; so that in the doctrine of the Trinity are comprehended at least elements of the oriental, philosophical idea of the Father as an abyss of incommunicable substance, together with Christ's idea of Him as a living God and Father; the Platonic and Aristotelian notions respectively of "a simple substance above existence" and of "pure act," both of which exclude all differences in God, together with the notion of "Persons," which introduces diversities in Him; the Logos concept, which unites God organically with His creation, together with the emanation theories of Neo-Platonists and Gnostics,[48] which are meant to bridge a supposed impassable gulf between the divine and the created. All these different types of thought converge in this Christian Article of Peace. But they can be held together only when interpreted in terms of religion, and the value of this great effort of the human mind is ultimately a religious value.

The unresolved ideas and the challenging elements of dualism in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds have not in the course of history been the stumbling blocks that they are to-day. Beneath them, the true purport of the doctrine of the Trinity as insisting upon a God who is not only transcendent but immanent and incarnate, has been grasped; and it has had its practical, liberating influence for mankind. The doctrine of the Trinity may, finally, in fact be described as a charter of freedom for humanity. The Spirit dwelling in all men and the Logos in-

[48] The presence of these is revealed in the idea of the Son "begotten" and "the Holy Ghost proceeding"; and again, more clearly, in the doctrine of the angels, who come next in the series of emanations. To the same category of thought belongs a system of a hierarchical priesthood in which inhere gifts, or deposits, of truth, grace and authority by virtue of an "Apostolic Succession"; which raises priests to the position of "mediators."

carnate in the frame of a true man have given, in practice, to the conception of what man himself is a depth and a glory unattainable without them. The institution of slavery was bound eventually to disappear when the relation of God and man was illumined by the knowledge of a human Christ and a divine indwelling. Man's thirst for truth and beauty too, and the spiritual aspiration that distinguishes him from all the rest of creation known to him, have found their consecration and their perfect freedom in the worship of a God who is not only the ultimate Reality, but spiritual and "beckoning" too.

There is then irreparable loss for religion if we insist exclusively on the inconsistencies and unintelligibilities of the metaphysical doctrine of the Trinity and overlook the great truths for which the metaphysical language, the uncertain images and symbols, stand.[49] At the same time, the doctrine is intended to be a formal statement of theology and, as such, the traditional forms of it may not rightly be considered final: exact definitions of the Absolute and Ultimate must for ever be pursued. The offence of the Athanasian Creed is not that it stammers in the face of things unspeakable, not that it is a repository of beliefs irreconcilable, but that it claims to know clearly and finally that of which it speaks, inasmuch as it lays down that unless a man believe it faithfully he cannot be a Christian, nay, that he cannot have salvation. A similar anathema was attached from the first to the Nicene Creed; [50] and this attitude has resulted inevitably in diminishing the vitality of both Confessions, in removing them from the sphere of living faith to that, rather, of submissively accepted dogma and in tending to convert them into hallowed relics, or ecclesiastical decrees, or touchstones of exclusiveness.[51] The true sphere of religious dogma is not that

[49] "Let the images and the shadows go," said Gregory Nazianzen, "as being deceitful and very far short of the truth." (Orat. V, xxxiii.)

[50] Athanasius Ad Serap. Orat. g. 28; and Ep. Eusebii, appended to De Decr.

[51] Might not the long period of intellectual squalor which we call the Dark Ages perchance have been avoided, had the intellectual passion of inquiry which brought it to an end not been cast out with the Nestorian heretics? It was in obedience to insistence on correct thinking about these mysteries, rather than on the primary importance of discipleship, that they were expelled from the Roman Empire. They took with them to Nisibis the books of Aristotle, and through these, by devious routes, the study of Aris-

of law but that of reasoned conviction, and the ancient Creeds fulfil their right dogmatic function in charting the road which leads to still more careful definition. Setting out from experience of the world, men have reached the belief that in God there is an all-embracing Unity in which intellect may find a ground and explanation of the cosmos, and heart the purpose of life for which it longs. Setting out from consciousness of self, from what the Lady Julian of Norwich called "the made-Trinity of our soul," they have passed to think of "the unmade, blissful Trinity" in which we are "enclosed." [52] And the distinguishable activities in the plenitude of the divine Being correspond to the three ways in which God has revealed Himself, namely the power, order and law of the visible and intellectual worlds; the life and work of Jesus Christ, both in earth and heaven; graces and inspirations, directly to our spirits and in ideal humanity. "Thou, Whom we know through Thy creation, art the same That hath been declared to us by Jesus Christ, and witnesseth in our own hearts by Thy Holy Spirit." [53] The part of theologians from age to age, rising to the height of their task as declared by Clement of Alexandria, is to embody all these values in a formal doctrine; "asking questions in the Scriptures," particularly in the light of their critical study; "knocking everywhere at the door of Truth" — which will continue, and in a more exact sense, to include scientific truth if philosophy is to mean more than the internal consistency of purely intellectual concepts; "advancing by intellectual demonstration" and "the true illumination of their intellectual search" to "God-given knowledge" and "comprehension." An economic or pragmatic interpretation of the Trinity can never be sufficient except for purposes of popular teaching, in which fine intellectual distinctions can only give rise to perplexity.

Yet, when all has been said, the distinctive revelation of

---

totelianism (modified by Platonism) returned, to work the revolution that gave the Church the two *Summae* of Aquinas in the 13th century — to which we owe, for Trinitarianism, the finally unequivocal teaching that God is one Mind: Power, Wisdom and Love. (S. Theol. xxvii, 4, 5; xxxvi, 2; xxxvii, 1; xlv, 7.) Thus did the Nestorians return blessing for reviling.

[52] Revelations of Divine Love, liv, lv.

[53] Harborne Liturgy, Proper Preface for Trinity Sunday.

Christianity is not its formulated teaching on the manner of the Trinity, but the doctrine, based upon a historical experience, of a divine Incarnation. And, too, of a special character of divine Incarnation: for the distinctive teaching of Christianity includes that of the Cross, with its message of the divine Self-sacrifice of Love, issuing in the triumph of the Good. Nor is the governing experience of Christianity that of intellectual inquiry; or of mystical contemplation; or even of catastrophic rebirth, with its emotional sense of chains removed and of pure and serene light poured into a reconciled heart. It is that of profound and glad assurance that God is, and is what Christ declared Him.

THE BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS IN MATTHEW

SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

Episcopal Theological School

In his most recent book, the great Semitist, Professor Charles Cutler Torrey, presents a new theory to explain the phenomena of the Old Testament quotations in the Gospel of Matthew, and thus adds one more element to the recurrent debate on Aramaic origins of the gospels.[1] Hitherto most critics have held that the vast majority of citations in the first gospel were taken over from the Septuagint (or, more properly, the Old Greek) version, the chief exceptions being the *Reflexionszitate* or "formula citations," a group of passages introduced by some such formula as "in order that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through the prophet, saying" (1:22). The latter were thought to have been made on the basis of the Hebrew text, either directly by the evangelist, or borrowed from an old book of Christian testimonies or proof-texts, or, as Bacon believed, taken over from the Aramaic "targumic material" which had grown up in Syria around Mark's gospel.[2] Torrey completely rejects this usual view, which assumes that our Mt. was originally written in Greek. The original Mt., he says, was in Aramaic, and its principal source was the originally Aramaic Mk.; its biblical quotations were, however, in the Hebrew of the Bible. If, at many points, quotations in the Greek Mt. agree with Greek Mk., it is only because the translator of Mt. made use of the latter. Agreements between Greek Mt. and the LXX can be explained by (1) the influence of the LXX text on that of the gospels, (2) reciprocal influence of the gospels, especially Mt., on the LXX text, and (3) the fact that frequently only one rendering of the Hebrew is natural, hence Mt. and the LXX must perforce agree. In our present Mt. there

[1] C. C. Torrey, Documents of the Primitive Church, New York, 1941, chapter II.

[2] J. Rendel Harris, Testimonies, Part II, Cambridge, England, 1920, chapter VII; B. W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew, New York, 1930, pp. 470–477. The point of view generally accepted is reflected by Sir J. C. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae², Oxford, 1909. On p. 154 Hawkins classifies the "formula citations" separately, as having been avowedly introduced by the author or editor.

exists a large enough residuum of citations not influenced by the LXX, so that, according to Torrey, we may be sure that Mt.'s translator made his rendering from the Hebrew alone (save for a few places where original Mt. had paraphrased the text in Aramaic). Sometimes, indeed, Mt. bears witness to a form of the Hebrew text differing from the Massoretic.

We could accept this complicated theory of the relationships of the Greek and Aramaic gospels only if it were proved, on quite other grounds, that both Mt. and Mk. must have existed in their present form in Aramaic. Of this Professor Torrey is convinced, and so his theory of relationships becomes mandatory for him. Most New Testament scholars instead prefer the usual simpler explanation of synoptic origins. But even on Torrey's theory Mt. still contains material which must be divided into several categories, including Marcan, Q, and special Matthaean. It therefore becomes the duty of New Testament students to test Torrey's material to see whether the non-Marcan quotations will bear out his arguments, after which the quotations common to Mt. and Mk. may be discussed.

One may first ask whether Torrey uses all the available material, and the black-face type in Nestle's sixteenth edition [3] provides a rapid check. I have collected and utilized for this study approximately thirty-five alleged references which Torrey does not include. Some of these are of no significance; [4] others are worth studying,[5] and a few are of decided importance.[6]

Dr. Torrey considers all the citations in the order in which they appear in the gospel. It seems better, however, to classify the citations and allusions as follows: (1) formula citations, (2) those occurring in contexts of special Matthaean material, (3) those found in editorial additions to Q or Marcan sections, (4) those in Q contexts, (5) those in "doublet" material where Mk. and Q seem to overlap, and finally (6) citations in Marcan

[3] Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. Eberhard Nestle, revised by Erwin Nestle, Stuttgart, 1936.

[4] 2: 11; 5: 8, 28, 48; 7: 22; 8: 4, 11, 29; 12: 4; 19: 26; 24: 6 f., 10, 24, 38; 25: 46; 26: 28.

[5] 5: 34 f.; 6: 6; 9: 36; 10: 21; 13: 42 f.; 21: 33; 24: 21, 29, 31; 25: 31; 26: 38; 27: 48.

[6] 3: 17; 5: 3–5; 12: 40; 13: 32; 17: 5; 27: 46.

sections. When these are studied separately we arrive at important results bearing on Torrey's thesis, and some interesting by-products also.

The formula used to introduce the *Reflexionszitate* contains phraseology not found elsewhere in the gospels, and is as much a part of Mt.'s [7] formal style as "You have heard that it was said to them of old time" or "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." The quotations themselves are Mt.'s own editorial work — with rare exceptions they can be removed without harm to the context — and Torrey more than once uses citations from this group as specially pure examples of Mt.'s method.

Bacon says of the formula, "This is simply another instance of the well known habit of R^{mt} to adopt and stereotype phrases which he finds in his sources." [8] But a consideration of Mt. 3:3 and parallels indicates otherwise. Even if, as Bacon says, the pattern of the formula is Mk. 1: 2, it is not closely followed; Mt. rewrites it in his own style. The recurrent phrase containing the words τὸ ῥηθέν is from Mt. himself, not from any source, and this passage seems to prove it. It also suggests that Mt. can use some such formula even when he borrows from Mk.'s Greek; i.e. the formula is not an infallible guide to the source of the quotation. Nevertheless, the citations in this group have much in common; they are all drawn from the prophets or the Psalms, and exhibit a certain ingenuity in searching for proof texts.

Torrey's case stands up well in four passages, 2: 6 (= Micah 5: 1, 3); 2: 18 (= Jer. 31: 15 [LXX 38: 15]); 8: 17 (= Isa. 53: 4); and 13: 35 (= Ps. 78: 2).[9] The citations are practically independent of any known Greek version and the first two appear to render a Hebrew text with a metrical scheme of its own. Torrey is also probably correct in his belief that 13: 14 f. (= Isa. 6: 9 f.), an almost pure LXX quotation, is an interpola-

[7] I shall use the symbol Mt. indiscriminately to refer to our Greek Matthew and to its author or redactor.

[8] Bacon, op. cit., pp. 470, 475. E. Klostermann, Das Matthäusevangelium², Tübingen, 1927, p. 9, notes that the formula is Jewish; see the literature which he cites.

[9] Torrey, op. cit., pp. 49–53, 60, 68 f.

tion from Ac. 28: 26 f., with which it agrees verbally. The interpolation might well have been made at the time when Lk. and Ac. were separated and a three or four gospel collection made.

When we consider several other quotations, it is, however, necessary to reopen the old question whether in the first century A.D. or even earlier there existed a Greek version independent of the LXX ("Ur-Theodotion") which Theodotion revised in the second century to produce that version found in the sixth column of Origen's Hexapla. The clearest example is 4: 15 f. (= Isa. 8: 23; 9: 1).[10] We can agree that Mt. is independent of the LXX here, but does he use the Hebrew directly or, as Allen thought, another Greek version? Torrey's strongest argument for independent use of the Hebrew is the apparent poetic form. But here, as in 2: 6, the metrical character may be due to use of the prophecy in early Christian worship. In many ways Mt. has points of similarity to the canonical Apocalypse, where one finds snatches of song based on biblical material. Torrey is no doubt right in saying that *ὁδὸν θαλάσσης* is a natural translation of the Hebrew, but even if Aquila and Theodotion also adopt it, it is not the only possible way of rendering, for Symmachus uses *ὁδὸν τὴν κατὰ θάλασσαν* as the direct object of *ἐβάρυνεν*. Mt. and the LXX agree here in translating *Γαλιλαία*, while Aquila and Symmachus choose other words. While this does not demand contact with our LXX text, it suggests either a similar exegetical tradition or a Greek version. Furthermore, 2: 15 (= Hos. 11: 1), which renders a different Hebrew text from that of the LXX, has a reading very close to the *ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα αὐτὸν υἱόν μου* of Theodotion.

What kind of an Ur-Theodotion is possible? Some scholars think of separate and independent Greek translations existing at least as early as the first century A.D.[11] But the arguments of the late M. Margolis and his follower Orlinsky seem con-

[10] Ibid., pp. 57–59.

[11] See, e.g., A. Sperber, "The Problems of the Septuagint Recensions," Jour. of Bibl. Lit., LIV, 1935, 73–92; S. Lieberman, Greek in Jewish Palestine, New York, 1942, pp. 47–60; and the literature cited by J. A. Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, Internatl. Crit. Comm., New York, 1927, pp. 46–50.

clusive.[12] Such pre-Theodotionic readings as exist in the LXX would appear to be from the Palestinian koine, i.e. the LXX textual family prevalent in Palestine, and Montgomery furnishes the best explanation of these:

"That there existed some such body of received translation [as 'Ur-Theodotion'] before the Christian age lies beyond doubt; but we must not too quickly assume a written version. Very much can be explained by the hypothesis of a Hellenistic oral Targum, necessary in the first place for correction of faulty renderings, and especially of lacunae in G [the Old Greek version]. (It is found that early 'Theodotionic' readings generally appear in such cases.) And then we may link up this oral tradition with the Theodotion of Church tradition of the early part of the 2d. Christian cent." [13]

Such an hypothesis helps us, not only with the above passages, but also with 12: 18–21 (= Isa. 42: 1–4), which does not follow either the Hebrew or the LXX exactly, but sometimes adopts words from other passages in Isaiah, agrees with Theodotion in two phrases, and at the end conforms to the LXX.[14] Torrey is least convincing in dealing with 21: 5 (= Isa. 62: 11; Zech. 9: 9), and 1: 23 (= Isa. 7: 14), when he argues that agreements with the LXX here are meaningless because certain translations are inevitable, and moreover that Mt. disagrees with the LXX at every point where disagreement is possible. A careful listing of the Hexapla evidence shows that several times in these passages Mt. and the LXX agree against one or more of the other translators. We are therefore forced to con-

[12] H. M. Orlinsky, "On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies," Jour. of the Amer. Or. Soc., LXI, 1941, 81–91, especially his quotation of Margolis on pp. 83 f. and his remarks on p. 87.

[13] Montgomery, op. cit., p. 50. Every prophetic passage mentioned in this paper has been looked up in the Targum of Jonathan. While this yielded no positive results for the present study, it has convinced me more than ever of the correctness of Montgomery's general position. Mt.'s approach to the Old Testament is similar to that of the Targumists; e.g., his use of Isa. 53: 4, which seems so clumsy to us, is not unlike the Targum's interpretation, and in Zech. 9: 9 the Targum's *bar*, like the translations of Mt., Aquila, etc., is a literal rendering of the Hebrew.

[14] Torrey, op. cit., pp. 64–66. Bacon, op. cit., pp. 474 f., wrongly argues from this that "it becomes more apparent than ever that R's reliance was the LXX." As we shall see, the evidence indicates that, with few exceptions, the quotations taken over from the Second Source (Q) are much closer to the LXX than those made by Mt. himself. It is worth remarking that Mt. 17: 5 = Mk. 9: 7 also has contacts with Isa. 42: 1–4, and Mt. shows knowledge of this by his addition of the words ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, but he does not use the Hebrew here; he simply reproduces Mk., as so often.

clude that, while in the formula citations Mt. is not directly dependent on the LXX and cannot be dependent on Theodotion, *he often follows an exegetical or translational tradition akin sometimes to the one and sometimes to the other.* This would be Montgomery's Hellenistic oral targum.

Torrey's theory presupposes an Aramaic gospel with occasional Hebrew quotations. We come to closer grips with it when we consider passages where he believes that Aramaic shines through. His explanation of 2: 23 (= Isa. 11: 1?) is attractive, to be sure: "He dwelt in the city which was called Nāṣ^{e}rath; that it might be fulfilled which was said by the Prophets, that he should be called Nēṣer." But this does not demand that Mt. as a whole should be an Aramaic gospel, or even the acceptance of Bacon's Aramaic targum as an actual written source. It could simply be the usual explanation given in the church where the gospel was written. It is claimed also that 27: 9 f. is a curious Aramaic catena or paraphrase of Jer. 18: 1 f.; 32: 6–9 and Zech. 11: 13.[15] Much of the argument is good; to his point that ἔστησαν is a common rendering of שקל (Aram. תקל) in the sense of "weigh," I would add that Aquila rendered the word ἔστησαν, against Symmachus' ἐστάθμισαν, which also means "weigh." But one of Torrey's principal points is that Mt. differs from the LXX, Aquila and Symmachus in using the word ἀργύρια, which, Bacon remarks, is unique and un-Greek. Even so there is no special need to assume that Aramaic lies in the background. Everything is accounted for if Mt. reads Mk.'s ἀργύριον and draws on his memory of the Hebrew, or a current Greek translation, for the rest. What is most striking is that the catena in Mt. 27: 9 f. appears to have affected Mt.'s version of Mk. 14: 11; i.e. *Mt. is already planning to put this strange catena in at the time he rewrites the Marcan section.* This might even be an argument for *Testimonia.* A fantastic notion, yes; but the idea of anyone weaving these passages together at all is, by modern standards, fantastic.

Dr. Torrey has made out a good case for the use of the Hebrew text in these formula citations, which are nearly all

[15] Torrey, op. cit., pp. 85–88; cf. his earlier discussion, "The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem," Jour. of Bibl. Lit., LV, 1936, 247–260.

editorial, even if we do not accept his Aramaic gospels and suspect that Mt. has knowledge of Greek translations. If an orthodox Jewish rabbi today quotes the Old Testament to me in English from memory, I can be morally certain that he will not use the King James Bible or even the Jewish Publication Society's translation, though at some points these may influence his language if he knows them well; he will make a translation on the spot from the Hebrew which he remembers, and on the basis of the exegetical tradition which he follows. Such is no doubt the case with Mt., even if he writes his gospel in Greek and uses Mk. in its composition.[16]

Most of the other citations occurring in special Matthaean material (i.e. those which for obvious reasons omit the formula calling attention to the fulfilment of prophecy) are brief and permit no conclusions to be drawn. Several are imbedded in sayings of Jesus which have a good claim to genuineness or at least go back into an early stratum of gospel tradition. Mt. 6: 6 (not mentioned by Torrey) is interesting because it is so close to the LXX of Isa. 26: 20, but nothing certain can be based on it. The most important passage, 18: 16, is set forth, with its parallels, in columns, thus:

Mt. 18: 16	Deut. 19: 15	II Cor. 13: 1	I Tim. 5: 19
ἵνα ἐπὶ στόματος	ἐπὶ στόματος	ἐπὶ στόματος	ἐπὶ
δύο μαρτύρων	δύο μαρτύρων	δύο μαρτύρων	δύο
ἢ	καὶ ἐπὶ στόματος	καὶ	ἢ
τριῶν	τριῶν μαρτύρων	τριῶν	τριῶν μαρτύρων
σταθῇ	στήσεται	σταθήσεται	
πᾶν ῥῆμα.	πᾶν ῥῆμα.	πᾶν ῥῆμα.	

Torrey has pointed out how in a number of passages the New Testament has affected the LXX textual tradition, especially Codices A, F, and Q, and to a large extent this is undoubtedly true, particularly in A and Q in the prophetic books.[17] Here he adopts the B reading στήσεται, on the ground that σταθήσεται is a correction. But, as we shall try to show, the adverse judgment on A and F in the Pentateuch is not always justified. In

[16] Cf. the wise words of H. B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek[2], Cambridge, England, 1914, p. 398.

[17] Cf. Montgomery, op. cit., p. 49.

this passage there are two main variants: (1) Several minuscules omit the second ἐπὶ στόματος and the second μαρτύρων. Either influence of the New Testament text or mere abbreviation may be operative here. (2) στήσεται is read by B 120 and apparently by the Bohairic and some of the Fathers, σταθῇ by 53 (obvious correction), and σταθήσεται by A F M N Θ and the rest of the MSS. generally. Mt.'s σταθῇ is necessitated by his ἵνα-clause and would seem to be related to the usual reading σταθήσεται. It seems to me that the reading of A F etc. must be correct, and that Mt. and II Cor. are further evidence for it. Torrey says the πᾶν (which is not in Hebrew) is not significant, for it was necessary to bring out the sense of the original.

To consider the matter properly, it is necessary to bring in the evidence of St. Paul. II Cor., like Mt., has an abbreviation of the original passage which is decidedly close to the LXX. Torrey's usual position, when Pauline passages parallel the gospels, is that Paul presupposes our finished gospels. Without raising the question of how unlikely this is on general grounds, it is sufficient to show that in this case such an assumption is a most unlikely one. In II Cor., the Apostle is appealing to the Jewish rule of evidence in dealing with offenders whose misdeeds are so grave that they are liable to excommunication. He is still feeling his way. Probably his method in such cases served as a precedent in the Christian communities; at any rate the LXX maxim was probably quoted in all Greek-speaking brotherhoods, and the rule (however quoted) was followed in Mt.'s Syrian church.

Here the principle is developed still further along the lines of an incipient canon law; the pericope 18: 16–35 *belongs to a later stage of church organization than that which we find in Corinth in the fifties*, and it must be considered as a whole if we are to appreciate the picture. First of all, v. 16 enunciates the Old Testament rule as it had been applied by Paul. Then a definite, though simple, legal procedure is provided where private conciliation will not work (v. 17). There is to be excommunication, as in Paul's time, but the bare rule, especially if taken out of context, is harsher. Verse 18 finds no parallels in St. Paul; it is obviously addressed to Christian rabbis, and

leaves almost every sphere of judgment open to the Church. Verses 19 f. may have some contact with Pauline thought (cf. I Cor. 5: 4 f.); these are, however, sayings originally dealing with prayer in general and do not belong in such a context as this, though Mt. has forced them in. To all of this there is added a long section on forgiveness (vv. 21–35) that takes much of the harshness away from v. 17. The Pauline influence here is indirect and probably exerted on the oral tradition, but the section 18: 16–35 as a whole could not have come into being without the Apostle. Paul's "delivery over to Satan" in I Cor. 5 may be, if anything, worse than the Jewish *herem*, but we must not forget that in II Cor. the Apostle demands complete reconciliation of the penitent. Just so, Mt. modifies the harsh rule of his own church by appending the great parable.

Thus the only passage in this group to yield important results suggests that Mt.'s quotation may come ultimately from the LXX, and that the evangelist borrows it from his written source or oral tradition.

Still more striking results are gained from the study of additions made by Mt. himself (not his sources) to Q or Marcan material. It is quite likely that in 27: 43, Mt. is making a free quotation of the Hebrew of Ps. 22: 9, and that Torrey's judgment on 16: 27 (= Ps. 62: 13; Prov. 24: 12) is correct.[18] No certain conclusion can be drawn in other cases (5: 38; 9: 13; 12: 7; 13: 42 f., not all of them studied by Torrey). But Mt. 12: 40 has exactly the same wording as the LXX of Jonah 2: 1, and, while one might argue that it is the only way to translate the passage, it is a suspicious circumstance.[19] Of 21: 16 (= Ps. 8: 3) Torrey himself says: "This is the one passage in the First Gospel which can be claimed as sure evidence that the Greek translator chose the rendering of the LXX . . . the Greek rendering is correct." [20] The evidence of Aquila, Symmachus and the Sexta, which render the same Hebrew in very different ways, makes this still more certain. *This is an editorial passage in good Matthaean style* (note the *καί*, cf. 9: 28; 13: 51; 17: 25). Since there are no Marcan parallels, it cannot be supposed that

[18] Torrey, op. cit., pp. 71 f.

[19] Torrey does not consider this passage.

[20] Torrey, op. cit., p. 79.

a translator conforms Mt. to Mk. One cannot escape the conclusion that the final redactor sometimes uses a Greek version, or is influenced by it.

One would expect to find more evidence of the Hebrew Bible in the Q material than in any other part of the gospel, but this is by no means the case. Mt. 11:10 (= Lk. 7:27 = Mal. 3:1; cf. also Mk. 1:2) contains a rendering independent of the LXX, which goes back before Mt. into the Q tradition, for the manner of citation (*οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται*), found also in Lk., is not Matthaean. Bacon regarded this as an unusually pure type of Q citation, and thought that elsewhere the final redactor had conformed the quotations to the LXX.[21] We have, however, already seen that in his editorial work Mt. by no means consistently uses the LXX. We shall now present evidence to indicate that Q itself, before it came to the evangelists' hands, had already undergone LXX influence.

There are no fewer than four reminiscences in the Temptation story. 4:4 (= Lk. 4:4 = Deut. 8:3) is not destructive to Torrey's theory, but the evidence is uncertain enough that it gives him no help. 4:7 (= Lk. 4:12 = Deut. 6:16) appears to uphold his thesis. The other two quotations suggest the LXX.

(1) Mt. 4:6 (= Lk. 4:10 f. = Ps. 91:11 f.). Lk.'s form is fuller and is a complete quotation of the LXX (with *τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε*). Torrey notes that Mt. has the same text as the LXX, "with the exception that *ἐπί* is preceded by *καί*, which perhaps reproduces a conjunction in Matt.'s Hebrew. . . . Here, again, there is no evidence of deriving the reading from the LXX."[22] Can it be that the modern editor's habit of printing quotations in uncials or black-face has here led to a misunderstanding? The quotation leaves out several words in the middle, and Lk. separates the two parts with *καὶ ὅτι*, thus indicating the break; perhaps Mt.'s *καί* means the same thing (cf. the same *καί* in Heb. 1:8, 10; Mk. 7:10 = Mt. 15:4). Finally, there is no good evidence that the citations are *not* derived from

[21] Bacon, op. cit., p. 472.

[22] Torrey, op. cit., p. 56. Sinaiticus is the only LXX MS. that precedes *ἐπί* in v. 12 with *καί*, hence the LXX text is no problem.

the LXX; a glance at Aquila's and Symmachus' remains in Field will show that other renderings were possible.[23]

(2) Mt. 4:10 (= Lk. 4:8 = Deut. 6:13). Here the LXX exactly renders the Hebrew. Mt. differs from it in reading προσκυνήσεις for φοβηθήση and μόνῳ before λατρεύσεις. Torrey believes that προσ. is used to translate an Aramaic word (found also as a loan-word in Old Testament Hebrew), employed by Mt. because it fits in here and had been used in the Aramaic verse preceding, while μόνῳ represents a word which makes a better metrical line.[24] An alternative explanation might be that both peculiarities bring out better the teaching of the section and are natural changes to make in the LXX. But this is not all. Torrey waves aside one variant in the LXX as due to corruption from Mt. B F 54 75 P.963 etc. read φοβηθήση while προσκυνήσεις is the reading of A 82 and some fathers. This judgment may be correct. However, μόνῳ is added by A F^a N, sixteen or seventeen of Brooke and McLean's minuscules, several versions and fathers, and the important P. 963. This last is assigned by Kenyon to the early second century, and on it he remarks, "Since 963 gives support to the A text in Deuteronomy and the B text in Numbers, it appears to show that both these types of text existed already in the second century, so that neither can claim preference on the ground of superior antiquity." [25] While the possibility of influence of Mt.'s text on our LXX MSS. is by no means excluded, still if this palaeographical judgment is correct, the readings of A and its allies — at least in the Pentateuch — should be carefully studied and not ruled out of court; and the above reading may be pre-Matthaean.

One or two other instances will suffice. Mt. 7:23 (= Lk. 13:27) contains a reminiscence of Ps. 6:9. A careful study of the literary habits of the evangelists convinces me that it is Lk., not Mt., who has made the changes in Q at this point, that the Q form was practically that of the LXX, and that probably Mt.'s only change is the omission of πάντες. In Mt.

[23] See Bacon, op. cit., p. 473.

[24] Torrey, op. cit., pp. 56 f.

[25] Sir F. G. Kenyon, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible, London, 1933, p. 108.

11:5 (= Lk. 7:22 = Isa. 61:1; cf. Lk. 4:18 f.) the exegetical tradition of Q is that of the LXX; the rendering "restoring of sight to the blind" is adopted (with LXX, Aquila, Jewish Publication Society Bible) against "opening of the prison" (Symmachus, Theodotion, Vulgate, AV, ARV, American Translation).[26]

Matters become more complicated when we study citations in "doublet" material or passages where there is some reason to think that Mk. and Q overlap. Reasoning on the basis of the usual critical theory, there is first of all the possibility that Q's citations are from the Hebrew or the LXX, then that Mk. conformed them to the LXX, then opportunity exists for Mt. and Lk. to make further changes, after which textual changes can take place in the manuscript tradition of all three gospels. On Torrey's theory, there would not seem to be much need for the Q hypothesis. Mt. and Lk. write Aramaic gospels with the help of Mk. and other Aramaic sources; verbal similarities between the three gospels can be ascribed to the habits of the Greek translators, while Mt.'s peculiarities arise because his gospel contained the quotations in Hebrew. If such a theory be sound, particularly if Lk. had access to Greek Mt., one would expect Mt.'s biblical quotations to show themselves primary at nearly every point and Lk.'s to appear derivative, especially since Lk. has undergone more LXX influence than any other gospel. Instead, the doublet passages exhibit the phenomena which, on the basis of the prevailing critical theory, one would expect.

Consider, for example, Mt. 22:37, 39 (= Mk. 12:30 f. = Lk. 10:27 = Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18; cf. also Mt. 5:43). Certainly Mt. seems to be conflating Mk. and Q here. Torrey re-

[26] The quotation in Lk. 4:18 f. is an exact duplicate of the LXX of Isa. 61:1 except that it omits the words ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ. The passage then picks up a phrase from Isa. 58:6 except that it changes the imperative ἀπόστελλε to an infinitive, and concludes with a phrase from 61:2, changing καλέσαι to κηρῦξαι. Ac. 28:26 f. shows that Lk. obviously uses the LXX when he brings in a quotation of his own. One interesting and puzzling feature of 4:18 f. is that the changes in the LXX are in the interest of a more perfect chiastic arrangement; cf. N. W. Lund, Chiasmus in the New Testament, Chapel Hill, 1942, pp. 236–238. It would appear, then, that Lk. finds the citation in a source, since he himself is often indifferent to chiasmus.

marks that the Leviticus passage needs no comment. The first point to be settled concerns the LXX text of the Deut. passage. B (which Torrey follows) reads: *καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου.* This seems to be exactly the reading of P. 963, which — just because it so often agrees with A F etc. against B in Deut. — is important evidence. The most important variant is that of A F M N and a large number of minuscules, versions and fathers, *καρδίας* for *διανοίας*. Since all three of the gospels, in their present text, have *καρδία* in some form, the reading can probably be ascribed to their influence. Some of the other variants, especially in the Coptic versions, are clearly due to the influence of Mk. and Lk., but Mt. has hardly affected the LXX text at all.

The LXX text having been established, we proceed to compare the gospels with it. Mk's rendering corresponds to that of the LXX at a number of points. But in the place of *διανοίας* Mk. reads *καρδίας*; after *ψυχῆς σου* he adds another phrase embodying *διανοίας*; and in place of *δυνάμεως* he has *ἰσχύος*. There are no striking textual variants in Mk. at this point. It is not certain that Mk. uses the LXX, though there are points of similarity.

The textual situation in Lk. is quite interesting. Tischendorf's text, as printed in Huck's seventh edition, has *ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου*, followed by three *ἐν* clauses. But *ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου* is read by D 1–131–209 157 it sa aeth, and the absence of the article in the reading of B Ξ 0124 472 indicates that something may have happened to the text. Furthermore, the phrase *καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου* is omitted by D Γ 1241 it Marc. I suggest that Lk.'s text originally read *ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου.* This symmetrical form is more in accordance with Lk's style.

Now consider Mt.'s form. This is the same as the above conjectural text of Lk., except that it has *διανοίᾳ* where Lk. has *ἰσχύϊ*. With the exception of this *διανοίᾳ* it is a close reproduction of the Hebrew, which calls for *δυνάμει* or *ἰσχύϊ*. Torrey believes that Mt.'s translator originally wrote *δυνάμει*, which was later dislodged by a scribe who knew Mk., Lk., and the LXX.

The next thing to be observed is that Lk. has the whole pericope in a completely different context and that Mt. and Lk. contain the words *νομικός*, *πειράζων* (Lk. *ἐκπειράζων*) and *διδάσκαλε*. We know that when Mk. and Q overlap, Lk. frequently adopts the Q version of the story, while Mt. conflates the two versions. Probably that is what has happened here. Lk.'s story, including the reconstructed citation above, is the Q form. Mt. has woven together the two stories and in so doing has adopted the Q citation but has substituted Mk.'s *διανοία* for Q's *ἰσχύς*. This completely disposes of Torrey's "original Hebrew," so far as Mt. is concerned, in this passage. The original Hebrew lies back beyond Q's Aramaic material. We should note, too, that this passage speaks in favor of Bacon's theory that the Q citations are independent of the LXX, which we can accept only with reservations. Finally, when the above passages are taken together with other Q citations, we see that Mt. generally trusts the quotations which he finds in Q. It is when he makes citations on his own account that he goes to the Hebrew Bible.

Torrey fails to make use of the passage Mt. 13:32 (= Lk. 13:19 = Mk. 4:32 = Dan. 4:9, 18 [4:12, 21 in Greek versions]). Not only is this a classical example of the overlapping of Mk. and Q and the varying habits of Mt. and Lk., but it also has to do with an Aramaic passage in Daniel; here, if anywhere, we ought to be able to recover Aramaic words of Jesus. Mt. is behaving as usual; he has conflated Mk.'s form of the biblical reminiscence and Lk.'s pure Q form. When we compare the gospels with the two most ancient versions of Daniel, we see that all three use the Old Greek *τὰ πέτεινα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* rather than Theodotion's *τὰ ὄρνεα τοῦ οὐρ.* Mk. in one other point suggests the Old Greek (*ἐσκίαζον*; Mk. *ὑπὸ τὴν σκιάν*); but the verb *κατασκηνόω* and the phrase *ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ* in all three gospels agree with Theodotion (whose translation was, of course, not yet in existence). Here the exegetical traditions of Mk. and Q are mixed ones.

The largest proportion of citations and reminiscences is to be found in sections which the evangelist took over from Mk.

Here the results are analogous to those which were achieved in the study of Q citations. Many references fail either to yield a certain or an important conclusion.[27] In many cases, Mt. does hardly more than to copy Mk., with certain editorial changes which his habits made inevitable. Sometimes, indeed, the Marcan citation which he reproduces is based on the LXX, e.g. 15:4b; 21:42; 27:35; also 26:38 and 27:46 (which Torrey does not include).[28] But very often Mk. did not conform his tradition to the LXX. In 1:11 (= Mt. 3:17) he seems not to be conscious at all that the Bath Qol is derived from Ps. 2:7 and Isa. 42:1. Mt. is even less dependent on any Bible, either Greek or Hebrew, and gives us only a pale copy of Mk.

Another good example is Mt. 21:9 (= Mk. 11:9 f. = Lk. 19:38 = Jn. 12:13 = Ps. 118:25 f.; cf. Ps. 20:7, 10). Torrey believes that the metrical scheme is partly the evangelist's own. On the face of it, it would appear that Mt. uses Mk., merely leaving out the second blessing and inserting *τῷ υἱῷ Δαυείδ* after *ὡσαννά*. The burden of Torrey's argument is that in Hebrew Mt.'s first clause means "Save the son of David," this being a vague reminiscence of Ps. 20; and that *ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις* means "Give help from on high!" It is better to suppose that Mt. keeps Mk.'s tradition without raising the question of what the Semitic word meant, and for the same reason that Mk. kept it: the barbaric flavor of the word lends the account an air of verisimilitude.[29] Had Mt. (or his translator, on Torrey's theory!) been keen for clarity and conscious of the Hebrew Bible at this point, he could easily have translated "Hosanna"; all the ancient translators rendered it accurately. The one thing we can be sure of is that Mt. consulted neither the Hebrew

[27] 15:4a (= 19:19a); 17:11; 19:7, 19b; 21:13; 22:24, 32; 24:15; and 21:33 (not considered by Torrey).

[28] In The Four Gospels, New York, 1933, p. 304, Torrey discusses the Aramaic of the word from the Cross but says nothing of the evangelists' Greek interpretation. Mk. reproduces the LXX of the psalm almost word for word; why Mt. makes his changes, and on what basis, is not certain; but probably his sole motive is a smoother Greek sentence.

[29] Just so, in 27:46 Mt. fails to make a satisfactory emendation of *σαβαχθανεί* — unless, of course, Dalman's conjecture, not accepted by all orientalists, is correct; see F. W. Buckler, "Eli, Eli, Lama Sabachthani," American Jour. of Sem. Lang., LV, 1938, 378–391, especially p. 384.

nor the LXX, but used Mk. The phrase may originally have meant "Give help from on high," *but Mk.'s fuller account explains it better than Mt.'s.* Perhaps the phrase originally came into Mk.'s tradition because ὡσαννά was misunderstood as a shout of praise, and ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις was added from Ps. 148: 1, LXX. In any case, the citation goes back to the pre-synoptic tradition.[30]

But Mt. sometimes changes, in the direction of the Hebrew text, citations or reminiscences which he borrows from Mk. Two or three such cases are of unusual interest.

(1) Mt. 19: 18.

Mt. 19: 18	Mk. 10: 19 = Lk. 18: 20	Ex. 20, LXX	Ex. 20 (and Deut. 5:17), Heb	Deut. 5: 17–19, LXX (B)
οὐ φονεύσεις	μὴ μοιχεύσῃς	[13] οὐ μοιχεύσεις	[13] Not kill	[17] οὐ μοιχεύσεις
οὐ μοιχεύσεις	μὴ φονεύσῃς	[14] οὐ κλέψεις	[14] Not commit adultery	[18] οὐ φονεύσεις
οὐ κλέψεις	μὴ κλέψῃς	[15] οὐ φονεύσεις	[15] Not steal	[19] οὐ κλέψεις
οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις	μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς	[16] οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις	[16] Not bear false witness	

Some textual notes are first required.

(i) Among the three evangelists, only Mk.'s text furnishes difficulty. The above is the text printed by Huck, and is read by A N W X Θ Π min a b d ff^2 l q vg sy^{hl} arm aeth. The reading adopted by Westcott-Hort, μὴ φον. μὴ μοιχ., is read by ℵ^a (ℵ* — μὴ μοιχ.) B C Δ Ψ 61 579 c sy^s sa bo and Marcion's text of Lk. Other variants are of no importance. Probably we should follow Tischendorf on the ground that ℵ^a B etc. conform the text to Mt., a point to be added to Torrey's argument, p. 74, n. 42.[31]

(ii) The above reading for Ex. 20: 13–15 LXX is that of the B text. Mt.'s order is followed by A F M, and a large number of minuscules, versions and fathers. Brooke and McLean list the order οὐ μοιχ. οὐ φον. οὐ κλέψ. for two minuscules, Philo and various fathers, but this is only the reading of Deut. Probably we should conclude that here the B text is original.

(iii) This conclusion is further strengthened when we consider the situation in Deut. The text printed above is that of B. Once again, Mt.'s order is followed by A F M and many of the same minuscules. The Chester Beatty papyrus (P. 963) is in bad shape, but its reading seems to be that of B, not of A. Once again the B text seems correct.[32] Now it is further to be noted

[30] Torrey, op. cit., pp. 77 f. Cf. also Mt. 15: 8 f.; 27: 39; apparently also 24: 21, 29.

[31] Professor A. T. Olmstead writes me: "The reading which is in disagreement with the LXX is correct; agreement with LXX proves nothing." Generally speaking, this is true; but the tendency to conform the other gospels to Mt. is still stronger. Furthermore, Mk. could have been affected either by Mt. or by the A text of the LXX.

[32] Kenyon, op. cit., p. 109, speaking of the British Museum Coptic MS., says,

that the order of Mk. and Lk. is that of Deut., and the same order is found in Rom. 13: 9 and apparently in Jas. 2: 11.

Thus Mt. alone follows the order of the Hebrew of Exodus. Torrey accepts Allen's argument that Mk. and Lk. follow the order of the LXX. It would seem to me that Mk. quotes Deut., but not directly from the LXX. The pericope, which he has from oral tradition, uses μή with the subjunctive, and adds μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς. Lk. obviously copies Mk. Mt.'s οὐ with the future indicative need not be due to LXX influence. He probably has the Hebrew in mind, as his order shows.

(2) Mt. 24: 30 (= Mk. 13: 26 = Lk. 21: 27 = Dan. 7: 13). Torrey's point is that Mk. and Lk. (υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις) had no intention of making a verbal citation The Old Greek has ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, while Theodotion has μετά in place of ἐπί. Mt. (who has ἐπί) prefers to follow the Aramaic more closely, and Torrey seems right in saying that there is not necessarily any influence of a Greek version or any reason for thinking that Mt.'s text contained על in place of בע.[33] But why should καὶ κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς be an interpolation into the Greek Mt.? The LXX of Zech. 12: 12 has καὶ κόψεται ἡ γῆ κατὰ φυλὰς φυλάς, while Rev. 1: 7 has καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς.[34] Torrey argues that Mt. and Rev. must be in literary relationship, and that while the quotation fits in Rev., it is out of place in Mt. I fail to see that it does not belong in Mt. Probably both books get the phrase from floating gospel tradition; this I think the best explanation for various contacts between Mt. and the canonical Apocalypse.[35] Mt. has put two quotations together, as he does so often — as, in fact, in the very next verse (31). There the Marcan parallel (13: 27) is based on two quotations, the LXX (not the Hebrew) of Zech. 2: 10, and Deut. 30: 4. Mt. takes

---

"Like 963 and Θ, it agrees decidedly with A F rather than with B, a consensus which goes far to support the A text rather than B in this book. In the order of the commandments, however, it agrees with B against A F in placing the seventh before the sixth."

[33] Cf. Mt. 26: 64; Rev. 14: 14, 16; ἐπάνω in Justin, Apol. 51: 9; Didache 16: 8; Montgomery, op. cit., p. 304.

[34] Bacon, op. cit., p. 477, remarks that it is impossible to say whether the Hebrew or the LXX is responsible for this.

[35] Cf. my review of Torrey, Anglican Theol. Rev., XXIV, 1942, 259 f.

these over, adds a mention of the great trumpet of Isa. 27: 13, and corrects Mk. to conform more closely to the biblical text. In 24: 30 his memory of the original text has affected one quotation more than the other, but there is use of the Semitic.[36]

Our choice of method in these studies is of very great importance. First of all there is required a thorough use of textual criticism to establish both the LXX and New Testament texts. Then each piece of evidence must be considered in the light of the synoptic problem. When Professor Torrey's theory of gospel origins is taken as a working basis, it is true that many passages appear to be derived directly from the Hebrew, but if one classifies the passages and looks at them from another angle, their significance is seen to be somewhat different. Particularly is this so when the evidence of the Hexapla is studied and care is taken to allow for the characteristics of Aquila and Symmachus. But above all it must be realized that literary study is not sufficient. A consideration of Mt. 18: 16 in the light of its function in the gospel surely teaches us something about the date of the gospel if not its original language.

The formula citations were largely, if not entirely, made from the Hebrew text, but probably with the help of a Greek exegetical tradition. The final author of Mt. was not consistent in his other citations and reminiscences. When, on his own account, he introduced them into Q or Marcan material, he sometimes used the Hebrew and sometimes what appears to be the LXX. Though occasionally he conformed the citations of Mk. and Q more closely to the Hebrew, he did not always do so. In fact, he was not a completely consistent reviser. His modifications of Mk. and Q quotations are not very extensive, and often they are not in the interest of the Hebrew text but simply for the purpose of producing a smoother narrative.

It is clear that Mt. is not influenced by the LXX to anything like the same extent as Lk. or even Mk., and this is an important modification of Bacon's judgment. It might even be that if we could recover the original text of Mt., more of the LXX character would disappear, though I believe not very much. The

[36] Cf. also 9: 36 (not studied by Torrey); 19: 14 f.; 22: 44; 26: 31, 64; 27: 34.

text of the gospels is fundamentally in good condition. If its tradition had become extremely corrupt, it seems to me that Mt., being the favorite gospel, would have been forced into much more conformity to the LXX than the others; but this is not the case.

The problems surrounding Q are by no means settled — such questions as whether it was one document or several, whether it existed in more than one translation from the Aramaic, or in more than one recension, etc. — but it does now appear that Q had its own history in the Greek language and underwent the influence of the Greek Old Testament. How these phenomena can be squared with Torrey's theory of gospel origins I cannot see; certainly there is less evidence of knowledge of the Hebrew in some of Mt.'s sources than in his own editorial work.

This redactorial work is done in Greek by a man who is thoroughly at home in the Greek language and is also well acquainted with the Hebrew Bible, which he uses from memory, like a preacher, stringing together proof-texts and making clever, pragmatic use of them. Probably he writes his gospel in a bilingual church containing many Jews, somewhere in Syria, but not in the apostolic age, for Mt. is in germ already a Catholic gospel.[37]

Even though we may not agree with Professor Torrey, our debt to him is very great. He has proved that Mt. used the Hebrew Bible more extensively than previously was believed, and incidentally, by the discovery of early variants in the Hebrew, has probably furnished scholars with additional material for the criticism of the original text. Certainly his researches lay upon all New Testament students the obligation to discover, so far as may be, to what extent an Aramaic tradition lies behind the synoptic gospels.

[37] Probably no wiser estimate of Mt. exists than that of Jülicher-Fascher, Einleitung in das Neue Testament[7], Tübingen, 1931, especially the remarks on pp. 281 f., 287–294. Much the same point of view is expressed, and with more supporting evidence, by my teacher, Professor F. C. Grant, who taught me much of what I know about method; see The Growth of the Gospels, New York, 1933, chapter VII.

JEWISH MYSTICISM

RUFUS M. JONES

Haverford College

Professor Scholem, who is professor of Jewish Mysticism in the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, has produced a very important book, which will at once take its place in the list of the most significant books that have appeared on Mystical Religion.[1] Baron von Hügel's The Mystical Element in Religion came at the end of 1908. My Studies in Mystical Religion came out in 1909, and Evelyn Underhill's Mysticism appeared in 1911. We all three were working independently of one another and, without knowing that anyone else was engaged in the undertaking, we produced our results almost simultaneously, and though representing three different types of religious thought, we became intimate friends through our work, and all three books went through various editions. Dean Inge had already, in 1899, published his important book on Christian Mysticism, and in 1902 William James had published his work of genius, Varieties of Religious Experience. Between 1911 and the present date there has been a remarkable output of books on Mysticism, many of them valuable contributions to the subject, and Mysticism has become an important feature of the interpretation of religion in our time. But meantime there had been no adequate interpretation of the great stream of Jewish Mysticism. In 1913 J. Abelson published a valuable little book on Jewish Mysticism, and in 1935 Jacob Minkin wrote a popular book on The Romance of Hasidism. But for English readers there was no one book that did for Jewish Mysticism what some of us had been endeavoring to do for Christian Mysticism. Our neglect of this field did not in any sense mean or imply that we underestimated the importance of it. We all knew that this great stream had been running along parallel with our Christian stream. But only a person possessed of a wide range of languages could work successfully in this

[1] Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, by Gershom G. Scholem. Hilda Stich Strooch Lectures in the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, 1942.

field. If any one of us who were working on Christian Mysticism had tried to widen our sphere and include Jewish Mysticism, we could have done it only superficially and at second hand. Rudolf Otto was able to deal with Mysticism East and West because he was a Sanskrit scholar with other Indian tongues, as well as possessing skill and efficiency in European languages.

Professor Scholem comes to his task with a unique outfit of language qualification for the wide variety of speech which his field of two thousand years covers. And more than that, he has a peculiar aptitude, a striking gift, for the kind of research needed for this *magnum opus*. His range of knowledge and his expert insight fill the reader with wonder, and withal he knows how to write effectively. I have read every page of his book with satisfaction.

He begins quite naturally with a study of the general characteristics of Jewish Mysticism. It may be said once for all that the fundamental fact of first-hand mystical experience, the direct encounter with the living revealing God in the depths of the soul, is pretty much of the same type in all ages, in all lands, and in all religions. What varies is the interpretation of the experience through the attempt to communicate it and to make others see the significance of the inward event. Here in this business of interpretation and communication come into play the whole background stock of ideas and the prevailing philosophy or theology of any given period. Christian Mysticism down to the time of the Reformation, and in Roman Catholic communions down to the present time, was almost uniformly interpreted in terms of Neoplatonic thought, especially as it had taken expression in the writings of St. Augustine and Dionysius the Areopagite. "The Song of Songs," mystically conceived, and the writings of St. John have also furnished an important strand of interpretative influence for Christian mystics.

Jewish mystics to a far lesser degree have been influenced in their interpretation by Neoplatonism. A curious document known to the Middle Ages as "The Theology of Aristotle," but which was really made up of extracts from Plotinus' Enneads, had considerable influence. The Talmud, the various Midrashim of the Old Testament, especially the Haggadah, played

a very important rôle, as also did the writings of Moses Maimonides. But there is a surprisingly large stream of influence from the waves of the Gnostical movements, which continued in the East throughout the Middle Ages, and in various forms in the West until the downfall of the Albigenses. There was, too, in Jewish Mysticism a larger element of myth and folklore than for the most part in Christian Mysticism, and this element gave vivid color to many Jewish mystical writings.

Our author says (p. 36) that *Kabbalism*, which is the most important single contribution of Jewish Mysticism, "set out to preserve God and to blaze a new and glorious trail to Him, but encountered mythology on its way and was tempted to lose itself in its labyrinth," — i.e. the labyrinth of mythology. Of course every sacred stream that has flowed out of the spiritual Himalayas of antiquity has carried along some mythological silt. It is relatively more in some streams and less in others, but never wholly absent. It is a nice question whether "Mysticism" is the right term to use for these elaborate interpretations. They are not "revealed truths." They are not "communications" received from on high. The only reason that there is fitness in using the somewhat fluid word "mysticism" here lies in the fact that these systems of thought came to birth through persons who had profound mystical experiences, which gave them first hand assurance of a Higher Universe than the visible one, and made them feel that they were called out to a prophetic mission. But when they passed from their own mystical experience to the interpretation of it for others they resorted, as they were bound to do, to the most convenient and effective thought material at their disposal. Some of it possessed eternal significance and some of it was bizarre and ephemeral.

> "For every fiery prophet in old times,
> And all the sacred madness of the bard,
> When God made music thro' them, could but speak
> His music by the framework and the chord."

The first type of Jewish Mysticism with which this book deals is "Merkabah Mysticism." Palestine was its cradle, and it is even older in its beginnings than the Christian movement. Its aim was not the contemplation of God Himself, but rather the

vision of God's Throne, after the manner of Ezekiel's vision. This school of mystics, influenced by the Gnostics and the Hermetics, and at a later time, under the spell of the splendor of the Byzantine Court, was absorbed in attaining an ascent to the Throne and Glory of God. God Himself is too remote, too "wholly Other," for them to expect to attain a mystical union with Him, but, like their great fore-runner Ezekiel, they hoped to get by the living creatures, and the keepers of the gates, and in an ecstasy to see God's Throne of Glory.

Hasidism is, from my point of view, one of the noblest types of Jewish Mysticism. There are two diverse periods of it, an early one in Germany in the twelfth century — 1150 to 1250 — and a later one beginning in Poland in the eighteenth century. The rise of German Hasidism is a decisive event in the spiritual life of German Judaism, and it had a milder degree of corresponding influence to that of the contemporary Franciscan movement on the Christian Church. This Hasid, or Devout, movement aimed at complete serenity of mind; it endeavored to make religion purely an act of love, with a flood of joy in the soul, and it emphasized the importance of mystical meditation, inward and "brooding" prayer. It developed a technique of penitence. The Hasidim, like Meister Eckhart, insisted that God is even closer to the universe and to man than the soul is to the body, in fact, God is "the Soul of the soul." And, like Joachim of Fiori, they talk of "the new odour" that comes with mystical experience.

Abraham Abulafia is one of the most important interpreters of Jewish Mysticism in the long history of its development in the western world, and yet I am afraid his name is almost unknown in Christian circles. He is as significant for the stream I am now studying as Meister Eckhart is for the Christian stream, and everybody has heard of Eckhart, while Abulafia comes to most of us as a new name. He was born in Saragossa, Spain, in 1240. Eckhart was twenty years younger. Abulafia travelled widely, was steeped in the philosophy of Maimonides. He possessed a keen, logical mind; he wrote in lucid style, though his thought often reached a depth which no form of speech could quite express. He was dealing all the time with a world

which the five senses do not report. He developed a technique of meditation and emphasized the importance of ecstatic experience. His aim was to "unseal and untie the knots" which bind the soul in from its true Source. There are barriers which separate the soul and keep it from the Central Life, the Deeper Regions, where it really "belongs." When these barriers, these dams, are removed man at once becomes aware of his intrinsic relationship with God. There are different layers, different strata, in the soul, and meditation aims to center down into the soul's depth, where it can meet the splendor of the Shekinah, which is always "near." This meeting of the soul with God is called *Devekuth*, which means "adhesion," "being joined." The soul preserves its distinct individuality. It is not merged or fused into a union of identity with God, but it attains a conformity of will with the Divine Will. This "untying of the knots," this opening of the way to the deeper regions of the soul, ought to concern us all and make us thankful for far and forgotten Abulafia.

But, as almost everybody knows, the Kabbalistic Zohar, "the Book of Splendour," is the profoundest and at the same time "the most deeply hidden" contribution to Jewish mystical literature. It is one of the most significant mystical books ever written in any language by any people. The Kabbalah in its final form has in it the spiritual growth and travail of many centuries and it is a group-creation, but our author is convinced that the Spanish mystic, Moses de Leon, is the writer of the major part, the core, of the Zohar, and that it was written at the end of the thirteenth century. Here certainly was a man of genius. His work reveals many strands of influence, including Plotinus and the Gnostics and much more, but he himself is a unique creator of one of the most remarkable books in the entire history of mysticism. I think it is doubtful whether any other mystical book in the western world has had as far-reaching an influence as has the Kabbalah. The only rival to it would be The Imitation of Christ, attributed to Thomas à Kempis, but which almost certainly was the spiritual Diary of Gerard Groote, *edited* by Thomas à Kempis.[2]

[2] See my Flowering of Mysticism in the Fourteenth Century, pp. 234–249.

The God, or Godhead, of the Zohar, and of the Kabbalists in general, is "a hidden God," an Infinite and Absolute Being, unrevealable to finite minds that can know only by means of qualities and attributes. He is the *En-Sof*, the utterly Infinite. From this Ultimate Reality there emerge or emanate, by a process in the *En-Sof*, a series of Sefiroth or manifestations. From this mighty process we get ten stages of the Inner World, through which God descends from the inmost recesses of His Being to His revelation in the Shekinah. These emanations are "the garments you see God by," or "the gates of light," through which He reveals Himself. It is thus that

> "Life, like a dome of many colored glass,
> Stains the white radiance of Eternity."

Through this process of emanations the hidden Life of God pulsates in everything, though there is "an indissoluble remainder" in God which never comes out, never emerges, which remains transcendent. Man unites all the worlds in himself, and in his unfallen state as Adam-Kadmon he combined all men in one ideal, undifferentiated man. The visible world is full of hints and symbols of the invisible, and the initiated learn to read the *signs* in things seen, the meaning of the sacred letters, and so discover the secrets and mysteries of the hidden world.

Evil in the world is due to the fact that the fire of justice and wrath, which burns in God, breaks away, tears itself loose, and is no longer tempered by the quality of grace and mercy in God. It was here that Jacob Boehme, the great Christian Mystic of Silesia, got one of the central features of his system. Man's soul — Neshamah — is a Spark of the Divine Intellect, something of God, and during its earthly life it weaves "the mystical garment" that it will wear in Eternity, which is pretty much Dante's view.

Here we have in this great Book a mixture and fusion of mystical experience — "the kiss of God on the soul" — with a strand of Gnostical tradition and theosophical lore, accumulated through the centuries, but with Moses de Leon's Zohar at the center of it. It went over into the Christian stream through Pico of Mirandola (1463–1494), Johann Reuchlin

(1455–1522), Cornelius Agrippa of Nettesheim (1487–1535), Aureolus Paracelsus (1493–1541), Valentine Weigel (1533–1588), and, above all in importance, in Jacob Boehme (1575–1624).

Isaac Luria, with a group of disciples, is another of the great creative leaders of Jewish Mysticism — the Lurianic School — who have poured tributary rills into the great Kabbalah Stream. His habitat was Safed in Upper Galilee. His life and work are closely linked with Moses Cordovero, a famous mystical philosopher of the sixteenth century and the writer of an immense commentary on the Zohar. Luria himself was a man of profound mystical experience, a saint as well as a scholar, and, though he died in 1572 at the early age of 38, he had formed a group of disciples who carried on and interpreted his mystical system. When Luria was asked why he did not himself interpret his great experiences, he said: "It is impossible, because all things are interrelated. I can hardly open my mouth to speak without feeling as though the sea burst its dams and overflowed. How then shall I express what my soul has received, and how can I put it down in a book?" This reminds one of what St. Thomas Aquinas said after having a great experience in Naples, near the end of his life. He stopped writing his Summa Theologiae and was asked why he did not go on with the great work. He replied: "I have seen that which makes all that I have written and taught look small to me."

Perhaps the most striking aspect of Luria's teaching is the remarkable doctrine of *Tsimtsum*. This means "the Divine Withdrawal." In order to have a world at all outside of God, He must withdraw into His own Being and concentrate as *En-Sof*, for how can there be an external world if God is everywhere and all in all? We have here just the opposite to the theory of emanation. God withdraws and makes room for a created world. It is the exact counterpart of pantheism. This withdrawal was not quite complete. Some "sparks of light" from "the Pleroma, or Fullness of Light," remained behind in the realm of the lower depth and eventually there will come a great redemption, the *Tikkun*. Man can aid in this great redemption process. By the magic of inwardness, by mystical intention and

contemplation, he can find the exiled sparks of light and through prayer he can find "the silken cord" that takes him back from the outermost to the innermost, to the Shekinah of God. Then the soul, formerly an exile, finds itself where it "belongs."

Luria's mission was to be the interpreter of a spiritual way of life to a people in exile. The Jews had been expelled from their homes in Spain. They were a homeless people living, as of old, in the Diaspora. They needed an interpretation of exile. That was what Luria gave them. The universe itself, Luria tells them, is a realm of Exile, through the Divine Withdrawal, but it is the mission of the Jews, scattered to the ends of the earth, to gather up the Sparks of Light and prepare the way for the great Redemption and Restoration — the *Tikkun* — which is to end the exile.

The only other mystical movement with which I shall deal is the development of Hasidism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries — a movement which is still alive. The founder of it was Israel Baal Shem ("Master of the Holy Name") who died in 1760. Its sphere of most intense activity was in Poland and the Ukraine. It was at heart mystical, with a breath of modernity, a popular appeal, a touch of original Hebrew prophetic genius. It gathered up and freshly presented the heart and vital core of Jewish religion. "He who serves God 'in the great way,'" one of the Hasidim wrote, "assembles all his inward power and rises upward in his thoughts and *breaks through all skies in one act — that* is perfect worship." It was a revival of inward religion. "Old ideas lost their stiffness and received a new infusion of life by going through the fiery stream of a truly mystical mind." We get here, in modern Hasidim, another powerful emphasis on the interior depth of the soul. Its "upper root" links it up with God. The original mystical conception of the bottomless deeps within the divine *Torah* of Jewish revelation is here transferred to the soul of the Hasid saint. By descending into the depth of his own self the saint passes beyond the barriers of the world of nature and the exile, and finds himself at home in his Fatherland. *Personality* takes the place of *doctrine.*

Dr. Scholem ends his chapter on Hasidism, and closes his

striking book, with these last words: "The story is not ended, it has not yet become history, and the secret life it holds can break out tomorrow in you or in me. Under what aspects this invisible stream of Jewish Mysticism will again come to the surface we cannot tell. . . . To speak of the mystical course which, in the great cataclysm now stirring the Jewish people more deeply perhaps than in the entire history of Exile, destiny may still have in store for us — and I for one believe that there is such a course — is the task of prophets, not of professors."

THREE THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

In the Michigan Collection there are three fragmentary papyri, which have these points in common: they are definitely Christian in character and though fairly legible have not thus far been identified. All seem to be of an homiletic or interpretive character but the extent of each is too small to admit of a more definite classification. All of the other Christian fragments in the Michigan Collection have already been published and the fact that these have thus far proved uninterpretable is a sufficient reason why they should no longer be kept in concealment. I am accordingly taking advantage of the kindness of the Editor to print them in the Harvard Theological Review. I hope that another may succeed, where I have failed, and in case such an interpretation or identification calls for changes in the readings here published, I shall be glad to reëxamine the papyri or even to send photographs.

Inv. 927 $11\frac{1}{2} \times 8$ cm. 4th century

This fragment is part of a leaf of a book written on both sides by the same hand. The top margin and the beginnings of the lines on the verso are preserved.

recto

1]θ̣αλασσα̣[·]ι̣[
2 ..... την πετραν τ]ην στερεαν τον δε ξενο[ν
3]π̣ροσηκουση ετιμωρησα
4 το .....]ε̣αι ηξιωθη βαστασαι τοις
5]των κοιματων γενη̣[
6]περι την ερημον[
7]και τω Μωυση ὑπ[
8]ον και εστιαται τον̣[
9]δια τ̣ουτο τιμαται[
10 τυ]πος χῡ κηρυσσομεν[ο]ς
11]ο̣ν ουν τω[ν] θεμελι
12 ων .....] τ̣ω ουρανω
13] μελει

verso

1]οι ωδε και μ̣[
2 χεωμην ητις ὑπο[
3 μενον φιλοξενοις ε.[
4 αυτου γαμων νυμφ[
5 θαλαμοι δε και παστο[ι ..... διαι

6 τ]ωμεν̣οι τοις ευσκε[πτοις
7 ν]απης χωριον πε[τρινον
8 κ̣αι πολλυν ο γεννω̣[μενον
9 και Συμεων εκει α̣[. . . . . Ζαβου
10 λων Ασσηρ και Νεφ[θαλειμ
11 και βενι[αμι]μ και[. . . . . εν
12 θαδε λει[

The combination στερεαν πετραν is found in Isaiah 50. 7, where the verb used with it is in the first person as possibly ετιμωρησα of line 3 instead of ετιμωρησα[το as printed in the text. Yet not too much should be based on this similarity for θαλασσα of line 1, [πετραν τ]ην στερεαν of line 2 and ερημον of line 6 may all be parts of a geographical description fitting in with χωριον πε[τρινον and the location (εκει and εν]θαδε) of the tribes given in the verso. The general descriptive character seems supported by the close union of ερημον in line 6 with Μωυση in line 7. τυ]πος χ(ριστο)υ of line 10 seems to point to a Christian homily, especially if it is connected with Moses mentioned just above. For τω[ν] θεμελι[ων and τ̣ω ουρανω of lines 11 and 12 compare Rev. 21. 19.

For the verso the doubtful letter at the end of line 3 is probably an ω or ο or φ. Professor Nock suggests that in lines 4 and 5 there may be some reference to one of the Gospel parables about a wedding.

The tribes named in lines 9–11 are so far as preserved given in the order of Origen, Hom. 23. 1 on Joshua.

Inv. 3788 6 × 3 cm. 3rd or 4th century

This is a small fragment of a leaf written on both sides in the same hand. The margin is preserved only at the bottom.

recto 1]λαβ[
2 τ]ουτον[
3]ε̣ τον λογον̣[
4 τω]ν̣ καιρων ο θ̣[ς
5 το]υτ' εστιν ε[
6 τ]ο̣ν προφητη[ν̣
7 ε]γενηθη υπα̣[
8 ιη]ν χρν τον β[ασιλεα
9 επ]ιστραφεντα[

verso 1] μαλο̣[
2]ν[ο]νε[

3]ασαια ιδυι[
4]τα γαρ ποιει[
5 το]υτων δια[
6]μαζετε ο[
7 νεκρο]υς ποιω ανα[στηναι
8 λ]επρους καθ[αιρειν
9]παραλυτου[ς

In line 4 of the recto Professor Nock suggests επι των υστατω]ν καιρων. With line 6 of the verso compare Luke 3. 4, ετοιμασατε την οδον. In υπα[of line 7 the alpha is almost certain, though only a stroke slanting to the left is preserved. No other vowel is possible. In line 8 λ]επρους καθ[αιρειν] is read on the suggestion of Professor Nock. The reference is to miracles of Christ or of one of the Apostles. In line 9, παραλυτους is for παραλυτικους; compare Artemidorus, Onirocrit. 4. 67.

Inv. 1574 recto. verso blank. 10 × 6 cm. 4th century

No certain margins are preserved, but it appears to be a fragmentary column from a roll.

1]πο[·] ηραι καρυμμ[
2 μακαρ]ιοι οι πινωντες και διψωντες τα σοφικα
3 μα]καριοι οι εραυνωντες τα μαρτυρια ξογ
4]ευροι ανδρηζυτον εν νεοτικτω
5]παταμινις και σκηνησεται τα θηρια
6]ωσει τω γεροντι αυτου σιαγω
7]σεται ονιδισμων οτι ευσιμ
8]ται τα οστε[α
9]αρφαισθαι εαν χομοι
10]ταν[·]πρεα[

Lines 2 and 3 show imitation of the beatitudes but hardly such as would be used in an interpretive homily. The fragment as a whole is too dim to be read with any degree of certainty. Most of the letters marked with a dot below are really doubtful.

Henry A. Sanders

University of Michigan